

Nonconformist.

"THE DISSIDENCE OF DISSENT AND THE PROTESTANTISM OF THE PROTESTANT RELIGION."

VOL. VII.—NEW SERIES, No. 68.]

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1847.

[GRATIS.]

BRIEF NOTICES RESPECTING THE PROPOSALS OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR POPULAR EDUCATION, 1847.

[The following admirable analysis of the Government Education Scheme is published in the form of a tract by Mr. Gregson, of Darwen, and we have pleasure in copying it, with the permission of the writer, into our columns. It appears to us the most complete and searching exposure of the measure that has yet been published. Although somewhat long for the columns of a newspaper, it is well worthy of an attentive perusal.]

In the year 1833 the Parliament voted £20,000 to the Lords of the Treasury for the purpose of assisting in the erection of schools. The Ministers of the day proposed that this sum should be distributed in connexion with two institutions already in existence—the National School Society and the British and Foreign School Society. Of these the former was understood to be conducted by members of the Church of England exclusively; and the latter by members of various religious bodies, the Church of England itself included. Many Dissenters disliked and opposed this measure from the first; and steadily refused to take advantage of it. But a larger number of their brethren were in favour of the measure, and the nation in general expressed their approbation of it. The earnest remonstrances of the Dissenting minority, however, and their consistent resolution not to use any portion of the grant, soon began to influence their brethren. The fear arose that the Government having provided schools, might, on the same plea, provide teachers also. It was soon found difficult to answer the reproaches of those members of the Establishment who charged Dissenters with inconsistency for objecting to a State church, and yet receiving State-assistance for the education, and the religious education too, of their own children and their neighbours'. And, in short, it was perceived, that efforts to dissolve the connexion between the Church and the State, a connexion deemed by Dissenters so injurious to the honour of the Lord Jesus, must be importantly impeded, if not altogether prevented, should Dissenters in general receive State assistance in the erection of their schools. The consequence was, that Dissenters applied for a small portion only of the money to which they were supposed to be entitled. As years passed, they took a still smaller proportion of their share. And though from the year 1833 to the present time a grant has been annually made by Parliament, almost all of it that has been expended has been expended in connexion with the Church of England; while the Evangelical Dissenters have received so very small a sum as is not sufficient to subject them as a class, whatever may be the case with individuals, to the charge of inconsistency with their acknowledged principles. Yet the Dissenters were not prepared in the year 1839 to oppose the wish of the Government for an extension of their educational powers. The feeling had been widely spread, that evil enough was already in progress, and that no increase of it could be borne. An increase, however, was proposed, and was effected; and that, too, with at least the tacit consent of the chief part of the Dissenters. For in the year 1839 the Government introduced a measure, of which the measure now proposed in the year 1847 seems nothing more than an expansion. Many Dissenters, it is true, maintain that principles are embodied in the present scheme which were not embodied in that of the year 1839. They seem to think that by this course of representation they reconcile their silence in 1839 with their complaints in 1847. The matter is not worthy of much thought; but their brethren who complained in 1833, and who have never ceased to complain from that time to the present, think it would be both more candid and more dignified to confess, that first in 1833, and afterwards in 1839, they allowed themselves to be deceived. For, assuredly, these further-seeing brethren have all along expected the development from the scheme of 1839 of such a scheme as that of 1847, or of a worse even, if possible, than that. And they do not discover in the present scheme anything more than a wider application of the very principles which when embodied in the scheme of 1839 were, if not approved, tacitly sanctioned by the great majority of the Evangelical Dissenters. It will now be proper to recollect what was actually done in 1839.

At that time the Whig Ministry, of which Lord Melbourne was the head, presided as the Sovereign's advisers over the national affairs. Lord John Russell, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, addressed a letter to the Marquis of Lansdowne, the President of the Privy Council, proposing that a committee of this Council, consisting of the Queen's chief Ministers exclusively, should be formed "for the purpose of considering all matters affecting the education of the people." His lordship further proposed, that this committee, instead of the Lords of the Treasury, should thenceforth expend the sums which Parliament might annually grant, and that a grant of £30,000 instead of £20,000 should from that time be requested. Either, now, Lord John Russell had thought, or he had not

thought, of the full meaning of the words that he employed. The truth perhaps is, that he used more comprehensive words than he intended, though meaning still much more than he was commonly supposed to mean. Thus, it is pretty certain, that by "people" he meant "manual operatives and paupers only." For bold as some reputed him to be, he was scarcely bold enough to subject the public schools and the Universities of the country, not to speak of the countless private schools, to the consideration of this committee. Yet, on the other hand, it is not credible, that by "all matters affecting the education of the" operatives and the poor, he meant no more than the erection of more day-schools. This, however, was the limited meaning which it pleased his friend and colleague, Lord Lansdowne, to attribute to the words when he found that the proposal to subject all the educational matters of "the people" to the consideration of the committee was regarded as most monstrous and absurd. If Lord John were careless enough to write "people" for "artizans and poor," he was not, it is quite certain, such a fool as to account bricks and mortar all the matters that pertained to the education of these people. There can be little doubt in the minds of those who have closely watched his lordship's course for the last twenty years, that the education of the poor and the labouring people by the Government has been one of the great objects continually before his eye. From the commencement of his public life he has so far suffered it to appear as to feel himself proof against the charge of deceiving those who have admired and trusted him; while again he has so often withdrawn it, partially or altogether, from his followers' view, that they have been as effectually deceived, either by themselves or by his lordship, as if he had repudiated it distinctly and for ever.

In accordance with Lord John's advice, the Committee of the Privy Council was appointed, the rules which they deemed fit to regulate their conduct were in the form of "Minutes," or Records, of their proceedings, submitted to the eye of Parliament, and a sum of £30,000 was requested for their use during the ensuing year. The proposal was earnestly opposed in both Houses of Parliament. In the House of Commons, Lord Stanley declared that "if this scheme were sanctioned, the whole education of the country would be put into the hands of the Committee of the Privy Council." He accordingly proposed an address to her Majesty, praying that she would be pleased to rescind the Order which she had given in Council for the appointment of the Committee; and his representations had such power that the Ministers rejected his proposal by a majority of only two in a House fuller than is generally seen. In the House of Lords, the Archbishop of Canterbury moved for a similar address to the Queen. "He appealed to their lordships, whether a very large and undefined discretion was not left to the Committee, discretion which might be very grossly abused. He could not wonder that the Established Clergy, the great portion of the Protestant Dissenters, and, indeed, all who had the interests of religion at heart, should feel alarmed at this enormous power being given to the Committee. He agreed with a great portion of the people of this country, that a power was thus conferred upon the Committee, which ought not to be entrusted in the hands of any number of men, and certainly not to men who were exclusively Members of her Majesty's Government." He said further, "that one cause of the great sensation felt throughout the country was, that those Minutes laid the foundation for a permanent system without application to Parliament." And such remarks from such a personage produced, of course, a deep impression on the House of Lords. The Ministers did all they could, however, to counteract the influence of the Archbishop's speech. Thus, the Marquis of Lansdowne acknowledged "it had struck him that the words of Lord John Russell were of too large a character, liable to misconstruction and misinterpretation, and involving a scope of action into which a Committee of the Privy Council, consisting entirely of her Majesty's Ministers, ought not to engage. And, therefore, he had, in the advice which he had had the honour to give to her Majesty, confined the operation of the Committee of Council to the superintendence of the distribution of the grants voted by Parliament." He said, too, "that if one thing more than another marked the Government's sense of this being a delicate question, it was the manifestly temporary nature of the proposal, recallable as it was at pleasure and capable of being modified or enlarged as the interests of the public required. So much, then, for this temporary Committee, responsible to Parliament for the administration of the funds placed in its hands. The Archbishop, however, carried all before him; and the Lords resolved, by a majority of 111, to present the address that he desired to the Queen. And the address was consequently presented. But the Ministers persisted, and having obtained the grant from the Commons, they met with no more opposition from the Lords. And thus the measure was established; though to understand it fully, and to see its connexion with the measure now proposed, various matters must be borne in mind and well-considered.

The transfer of power from the Lords of the Treasury

to the Committee of Council may at first appear desirable rather than not. For the Committee as a body will always be composed of more important personages than the Treasury Lords considered as a body. A Privy Councillor is under peculiar and solemn oath to advise her Majesty to the best of his ability. As those Councillors only enter into the Committee who are in the highest offices in her Majesty's service, their ability may be reasonably deemed superior to that of the junior Lords of the Treasury. And as misconduct would in their case be followed by disgrace and penal consequences, much more direful than would pursue their subalterns if faulty, they, of course, feel the stronger motives to upright and honourable conduct. It may be thought, too, that of the two chiefs the President of the Council is likely to have more leisure for attention to educational matters than the First Lord of the Treasury, who is also the responsible head of the whole Government. But specious as these considerations are, they, in fact, suggested that the whole arrangement is an evil one. For had it not been intended that the powers of the Committee should far exceed the powers of the Treasury Lords, no alteration would have been proposed. Lord Stanley, a politician by profession, and the Archbishop, one by choice and study, though engaged in a very different profession, well knew that the transfer would be followed by an enlargement. If sworn Privy Councillors and the first Officers of State were to be substituted for the Commissioners of the Treasury, it was because "matters pertaining to education," of too much importance for the latter to consider, were to be submitted to the control and superintendence of the former. The Marquis of Lansdowne insinuated that building matters would be supervised by the Committee; but no noble lord believed the insinuation. The House knew that the contrary was conveyed by Lord John Russell's words; they knew, too, that the contrary would soon appear in fact. Besides, the very oath that binds a Privy Councillor to give his best advice, binds him to keep the secrets entrusted to his keeping. No Board composed of men under the obligation of an oath like this, and presiding over measures so minute as the erection and the management of village day-schools, can ever, possibly, obtain a nation's confidence. No such Board has ever yet existed without violating all the trust it has conciliated.

It may excite surprise that the House of Lords, having gone so far as to address the Queen against her Ministers, should not also have refused their assent to the Commons' vote of £30,000. But it is not easy for the House of Lords to interfere in money matters. According to the uses of Parliament, usages equivalent in force to statute law, they must have refused the entire grant, if any portion of it; and, to refuse the entire, when for many years they had unanimously voted two-thirds of the amount, and when the personal honour of the Ministers, and their official character as well, seemed pledged for the maintenance of the course already viewed with favour, would have appeared too factious towards the Ministry, and too disrespectful towards the Commons. The Commons, too, having refused to protest against the transfer of power to the Committee of the Council, could hardly fail to substantiate their vote of confidence by an increase of the grant. And so the measure was established.

But it was asserted at the time, and it has been frequently asserted since, that there are two great checks upon the Committee in the exercise of their new powers; the right of Parliament to refrain from making the annual grant at any time, and the right of the Commons to impeach the Committee, if suspected of misdemeanours, at the bar of the highest judicial tribunal in the land—the House of Lords. But neither of these checks has much, if any, power in this matter; for no one expects that the money voted by the Parliament, and disbursed by the Committee, will produce unmingled evil. All history shows, however, that nothing short of this, if even this, would prompt the Parliament to refuse a grant already made for many years in uninterrupted succession; especially when noisy claimants in all parts of the country could show proof that, on the expectation of such aid as had been freely made to others like themselves, they had either outlaid money or undergone responsibility or trouble. And the right of impeachment has as little power as that of stopping the supplies; for unless the offence imputed to a Minister be enormous, such too as are scarcely punishable, at least fully, by common law, no member of the House of Commons would undergo the risk and pains of instituting and conducting an impeachment. We have lately seen the almost insuperable difficulties in the way of bringing the Poor-law Commissioners to punishment; and it is not likely that they will suffer any punishment at all. No man, however, in the country thinks them guiltless; few men think of them otherwise than as most guilty. Yet Lord John Russell declares them guiltless, in the opinion of the Queen's responsible advisers, of all offences against the law. To impeach them, therefore, is the only constitutional course left; and yet an impeachment has never been mentioned. These Commissioners, indeed, may be thought men of too little consequence to be dignified by an impeachment;

the doubt is rather whether legal evidence could be obtained of sufficient power to sustain an impeachment if commenced. Meanwhile, the national impression is, that there is scarcely a union in the kingdom that has not suffered from either their injustice or their incompetency and neglect. Be this as it may, their case illustrates the difficulty of conducting an impeachment. The Committee of Council may notoriously abuse their power in every parish in the land, without undergoing the least risk of an impeachment. Beneath their away, committees may be restricted, teachers oppressed, and scholars enslaved or persecuted, without the slightest means or opportunity of acquitting redress. The collection of evidence in cases numerous and important enough to convict, not a servant of some fault, but the chiefs themselves of high crimes and misdemeanours, and to establish against them a charge of gross delinquency, would alone require an almost incalculable expenditure of money, time, and labour. It is not too much to say, then, that neither money will be withheld, nor impeachments instituted, though every parish in the kingdom suffer flagrant evils, such evils, too, as the Committee are bound and expected to prevent.

It was little to the honour of Dissenters that they did not rigorously oppose the first appointment of the Committee of Council. Few of them, however, perceived the latent evils of the scheme. And though all of them ought to have been instructed after the exposure of these evils by Lord Stanley and the Primate, they, unfortunately, at least some of them, assumed that what an archbishop and an apostate Whig denounced must necessarily be good. They were already strangely fascinated by the Whigs, especially by Lord John Russell. His lordship was to them the *beau idéal* of a perfect statesman. The constitution and his lordship were inseparable. At all events he said so; and Dissenters took him at his word. And he said that the Committee was a fitter body than the financial lords to attend to popular education; and it sounded as if it must be so; and the Primate and Lord Stanley were the chief parties to deny it; and the Dissenters no longer had a doubt; and so the measure was established. Two votes in the Commons' House would then have saved the country. A very few Dissenters might have commanded those two votes. But their friends, the Whigs, would have been annoyed and conquered; and so "they wrapped it up;" and the measure was established.

Perhaps, too, another cause restrained the Dissenters from resisting the Government; the same cause which seems chiefly to have instigated the Tories to resist. And this was nothing else than a conviction of Lord John Russell's dislike to the Established Church. Both the Tories and the Dissenters seem to have believed, that the Committee of the Privy Council would *privily* employ their powers for the subversion of the Church, educating the children of the operatives and the poor in such principles and sentiments as would, when generally current through the land, insure the speedy abolition of the Establishment. But little did either of them know of Lord John Russell and the Whigs. What the Whigs really proposed and desired may be best determined from their present deeds; especially as some few men who had watched them rather closely charged them, even then, with the designs which they are now endeavouring to fulfil. Nothing, doubtless, was further from the thoughts of the Whigs than to undermine "the Establishment," and the civil institutions necessarily depending on it. Just as the late Earl Grey declared, to a Tory lord, that the Reform Bill would issue in the greater prevalence of the aristocracy, might the Melbourne Ministry have pacified the Tories with the strong assurance that their educational machinery would altogether subvert the wishes of "the Church." But they said nothing of the kind; and no one imputed to them such Conservatism; and so the Tories opposed them, and so the Dissenters let them have their way. The Archbishop, indeed, spoke of the Dissenters, and of all who had the interests of religion at heart, as alarmed at this enormous power being given to the Committee. He evidently wished to alarm them; but they would not be alarmed by him. He spoke, too, of a great sensation as excited in the country by the Council's Minutes; but it was confined to his own party. From the causes specified above—and partly, too, from the desire and expectation of some few Dissenters to appropriate to themselves a portion of the grant on easy terms—no sensation was excited, and no alarm was felt in the Dissenting communities; and so the measure was established.

In the course of time the Tories governed us again; and they, of course, had then a favourable opportunity of surrendering the power which they had denounced as unconstitutional and unsafe. But they found that almost all the money spent since the first grant was made in the year 1833, had been spent on behalf of the Church of England, and in such a way as they could not but approve. The case, then, looked no longer like the same. The Whigs had helped "the Church" to Churchmen's satisfaction; the Tories knew right well that they would do the same; and the Dissenters would take help from neither. The case, then, was altogether different. The power was evidently a beneficial power, and the Committee was as evidently a wise Committee. The Tories, it is true, had committed a slight error in the opposition they had offered to the Whigs' proposal. But it is never too late for bad men to mend, or for good men to become better. And since even the Whigs, bad as they had been, had striven to amend, the least the good Tories could do was to become still better. And so they purposed that they would; and would complain no more of "that unconstitutional Committee," and of the indefinite powers they possessed. They would not even apologize or account for their apparent inconsistency in prolonging the Committee; nor, while using the powers, say so much as "by your leave, Sir." So they entered quietly upon their office, and they did just as the much-slandered Whigs had done before them. And when, in the year 1846, the Whigs again became our masters, they found that Tories and all classes were quite ready to entrust a Whig Committee of the Privy Council with no less a sum than £100,000 to be dispersed within a year,

according to the pattern of expenditure now settled and approved. So they asked for it; and it was voted; and they graciously consented to expend it. Very few Dissenters, of course, have drawn at all upon the fund. As in former years, a portion of it has been given in aid of the erection of new town and village schools. Schools for the instruction of teachers, Normal schools as they are commonly called, have also been encouraged in like manner. Some amount, too, has been given to teachers of pauper schools, the schools in connexion with the workhouses. The salaries of inspectors and clerks have been also hence provided for. But it is only proper to repeat, that almost all that has been spent has been spent in subservience to the Church of England. While it is generally understood that "the Church" and the Dissenters share the whole equally between them, this representation is almost as remote as possible from the fact. No Government would care to ask for the small sum that evangelical Dissenters have applied for. Half of the whole amount seems promised to them, that an aspect of liberalism may be maintained. They virtually take nothing, and thus sustain a double injury; for they are injured when their money is appropriated to the support of a religious system they abhor, and they are injured further when, because a few among them choose to take the State assistance, they, the entire class of evangelical Dissenters, are made answerable for the deed.

It should not be omitted, that, in the expenditure of the sum placed at their disposal, the Committee of Council have already carried out, in part and occasionally, whatever they now propose to do on a large scale and by system. Many of their opponents maintain that, at the present time, they are introducing new principles. Even if this be true, the innovation is but slight. Inspectors and teachers have been paid by them already; and it is difficult, when one reads the account published by themselves of the Model and the Normal schools beneath their care, not to speak of the Penal and the Pauper schools, to avoid the conclusion that more is done to encourage the scholars in attendance than either would be done or could were the schools altogether independent of the Government. And it is not conceivable that men who, like Lord Lansdowne and Lord Russell, have made policy the business of their lives, should introduce into their present measures principles which, in the judgment of either lawyers or politicians, would subject them, whether for the principle's sake or on account of the manner of their introduction, to the charge of unconstitutional and unministerial conduct. They mean to die with their heads upon their shoulders; and take good care, therefore, to incur no responsibility but what the law advisers of the Crown participate without the least anxiety. Their conduct about education is, in this respect, like their later conduct about penal transportation. What they have done with immunity in a few instances of both, and in accordance with either precedent or statute law, they now propose to do in many instances, and in instances never contemplated by the framers of the law or the forerunners of the precedent. For this, no doubt, they are liable to impeachment, if any one would take the trouble to impeach them. Their liability, however, arises not from their introduction of principles already acknowledged by the nation to be bad, or from their proved adoption of principles, whether good or bad, without the national permission; but from their unauthorized employment of measures on the ground of former measures, when at the time these former were allowed, the nation had no expectation of the measures now in progress, and the Ministers themselves did all in their power to prevent such expectation. They are not, then, the less censurable, although their present conduct embody no new principle. They are, in truth, more censurable; for they stand convicted of an inveterate design to practise imposition on the nation. Instead, then, of engaging them to discuss the question, whether they are adopting new and unpermitted principles or not, it seems preferable to charge them boldly with the acknowledged fact, that under the apparent cover of past usage, they are now fulfilling plans not thought of by the nation when that usage was established, and deprecated, indeed, by both the Tories and themselves. We thus prevent digression from the proper subject of dispute; we take a position which is demonstrably impregnable; we excite deserved suspicion, that the principles themselves which are now to be extensively applied, are bad; and we thus prepare the way, whether they be old principles or new, for their speedy and absolute extinction. Let us now return to our historical survey.

Soon after the Government, in the year 1846, had obtained the grant of £100,000, the discussion concerning the State-education of "the people" was renewed among Dissenters with fresh vigour. The singular exposure of the British and Foreign School Society to the total loss of either State aid or voluntary aid—their published dissatisfaction with the Government inspector of their schools—the general persuasion that of this £100,000 the whole would virtually conduce to the support of the State-church—above all, Lord John Russell's repeated declarations of desire and intent to extend State education far beyond the sphere it hitherto had occupied—all these circumstances together excited Dissenters to a lively and an earnest reconsideration of the general subject in all its principles and bearings. Meanwhile, the plans of Government could not be conjectured even. One thing only appeared certain, that Lord John Russell and the heads of the Church were on terms of cordial and confidential intercourse. Dissenters reasonably became more vigilant. Parliament met, however, and the Queen, as usual, made a speech; but her Majesty made no allusion even to the education of "the people." Most men thought this favourable; the more wary few regarded it as ominous. But while they were still settling the character of this omission, more "Minutes of Council" were laid upon the tables of both Houses, and the plan, which all the senators agree is no plan, was laid bare. The chief information concerning the proposals of the Whigs was communicated by Lord Lansdowne to the House of Lords. Some men still urge it on themselves that these Whigs are honest men, lukewarm to "the Church," devoted to the Constitution, martyrs for liberty, patrons of Dissenters, and ignorant of the character of their

own measure. Lord Lansdowne's explanation of the "Minutes," contrasted with that which shall presently be given, will cast sufficient light on all these matters. A more artful speech was never delivered than his lordship's. The man who made it must have been well acquainted with his measure, "which is not a plan." He, and Lord John Russell too, must have given many hours, haply days and nights, to the study of it ere they could have possibly contrived an exhibition so calculated to mislead and mystify as was Lord Lansdowne's speech. The Tory lords and the high dignitaries of the Church were unable to repress their joy. Already in the secret of the true nature of the proposals, the delight manifested by the latter must have been excited by his lordship's Whiggish skill in concealing the real and intended character and bearing of the measure. The Dissenters in general were, of course, deluded by the Government, even though that Government was magnified by spiritual lords of every political complexion. But the "Minutes" were printed, and the delusion was dispelled.

The belief seems now completely justified, that Lord John Russell and his party have always set their hearts upon the objects aimed at by this measure. It may appear surprising, however, that, having been for years so cautious, they should suddenly obtrude upon the nation, in its present circumstances, such a measure as the one before us. But we must remember their position on entering again the service of her Majesty. For though the Tories and "the Church" were forced to acquiesce in Whig ascendancy, they still distrusted the Whig party, and Lord John Russell in particular. His lordship knew it to be impossible for him to conduct our national affairs unless "the Church" would sanction him, or at least would let him live in peace. This "Church," however, had fallen into much disquietude. For though, aided by the State, it had erected some thousands of schools in different parts of the kingdom, it found itself unable to supply them with either competent instructors or numerous scholars. The schools of Dissenters, whether professed or only practical, were still better conducted and attended. Few, too, of the laity had much sympathy with their clergy in this matter. The clergy, at all events, found that they themselves must do the work of providing for their schools, if the work were to be done at all. They were compelled, therefore, to conduct a system of periodical application for pecuniary assistance. In plainest terms, they had to beg, and often, too, to beg of the Dissenters. And they grew tired of this system; and all people were beginning to be tired of it too. And so, through the Bishops and the higher Clergy, they approached the Government; they showed that once more, after all, "the Church" was in great danger; they proved that on "the Church" depended many a venerable civil institution not dearer to themselves than to the Whigs; they pressed for prompt assistance; they declared that postponement would be ruin; and thus, whether the time was opportune or not, they forced the Government to do at once what the Government had always wished to do as soon as convenient season should arrive. The object was, of course, to obtain bribes for both teachers and scholars. If they could have obtained them from their friends in private and with only moderate trouble, they would, probably, taking all things into calculation, have preferred such a "voluntary" system. But they had tried it to such an extent as to ascertain the impracticability of "the Voluntary principle" in hands like theirs. Dissenters, however, would employ it, and with increased efficiency. The emergency was critical. They must be strengthened, and Dissenters weakened; or soon both Whigs and Tories would be without the Cabinet, and another sort of men, a sort of moderate and polished Cromwells, would be found within. And the Whigs believed it. They had, indeed, believed it long before, but had wanted opportunity. Opportunity was lacking still; but the pressure from "the Church" was strong,—strong enough, if resisted, to force them from their places. And they were unwilling, in their patriotism, to deprive their country of their service; and they, therefore, framed the scheme that we shall presently examine.

It is right, however, to state first, that the Evangelical Dissenters, with scarcely an exception, are unanimous and earnest in opposition to the Ministers' proposal. Whatever differences of opinion had been entertained respecting what it is desirable for a Government to do for the education of "the people," there is but one opinion respecting what the Government intend to do. Those brethren even whose hope had been most sanguine of a Ministerial plan which they could consistently adopt, have openly declared their firm conviction that no such plan will be proposed, or can be, while the State church system is maintained. These brethren will be subjected, of course, to the taunts of Lord John Russell and his party. But if they had hoped and expected from the Whigs what it is now found the Whigs are unwilling to accomplish, the Whigs assuredly had first prompted and then forwarded the deceptive expectation. It ill becomes the Whigs, then, to reproach our brethren; and the men who only have the right, have no desire. We are happy to be one in this matter, and the more so as we think we never shall be mutually opposed again on any kindred matter.

It is clear, then, that, whatever be the scheme, it will be of no advantage to Dissenters. A few Unitarians may avail themselves of its provisions; and a few schools, also, from which all religious instruction is excluded—schools conducted by men of all religious sentiments—may, though it is hardly likely that such will, owe to it much of their support. The Roman Catholics alone, in addition to the Church of England, are likely to desire the proposed advantages. Even their adhesion to the scheme is yet uncertain. Should they purpose to employ it, however, the members of the Church of England will most probably renounce it; and the whole effort will consequently be abortive. It must, then, be regarded as a scheme to support the State-church schools alone. Its real object is to aid the Church of England in instructing the children of the labouring population. Such, if it be carried out at all, will be its actual result; and, therefore, as such it must be treated. Yet there is no appearance of unfairness on the surface of the scheme itself; or, if there be any, it is to the dis-

advantage of the Church of England. For while it is proposed to help all schools alike, whose local managers will submit to the same general conditions, the inspection of the schools, one of these conditions, will be more rigorously conducted in the Church of England schools than in any other. For not only will the annual examination of a certain class of beneficiaries be extended in the State-church schools to the parties' acquaintance with the Bible, the Liturgy, and the Church Catechism; but this part of the examination will be conducted by the parochial clergyman in company with the Government Inspector. In other schools, the managers' or Committee's certificate that they are satisfied with the religious condition and attainments of these parties, will be esteemed sufficient: but in the State-church schools the parochial clergyman's testimony is required on these specific points. Nor is it required on these points alone. He must certify also that the candidates for the Government's favours pay satisfactory attention to their religious duties; and also that the housekeepers, parents, or others, with whom they live, conduct their household in a correspondent manner. As nothing, now, is likely to satisfy a clergyman except what conduces directly and entirely to the support of Church of Englandism, it follows that more strict provision is made for accuracy and discipline in the State-church schools than in any other. The condition, therefore, of affording help to these schools is more rigid, and, at first sight, seems disadvantageous. But when on a second glance we find its decided tendency to maintain Church of Englandism as it is, we see in it exactly what the clergy prize and earnestly desire. For security is thus afforded that the Government favours shall be granted unto none but well-instructed and well-drilled children of the Church of England. None but the State-church schools, as we have seen, are likely to be at all aided by the Government; and the chief aid granted there will be bestowed on none but such as cheerfully and effectually undergo the most perfect initiation that can be conceived into the mysteries of Church of Englandism proper. So much, then, for the first aspect, whether fair or unfair, of this measure, which, however, is no plan.

It is right to observe, that in the following examination of the details of this planless measure, the highest sums which the Whigs propose to pay in certain cases will alone be taken into account. Confusion may be thus prevented, and justice will be done more surely. For as we are not conjecturing what the measure will accomplish, but calculating what, if once established, it legitimately may, it is only fair to assume the highest estimates which it is proposed virtually to legalize. For the same reason, that the merits or the demerits of the scheme may conspicuously appear, we shall estimate its cost and its doings if ever thoroughly effective. The question is not how many pounds it will cost, and how many clerical pensionaries it will create, if vigorously opposed from this hour onwards while it lives; but what results of these and other kinds it may legally achieve if let alone. Be it good or be it evil, it shall not be exaggerated. Neither, however, shall it be diminished. It shall appear in its full natural proportions; and we shall then be most favourably situated to say what it is.

In all ordinary schools for the children of "the people" the complaint is common, that the teachers cannot keep the elder pupils long enough to serve as efficient monitors or assistant teachers. It is proposed, therefore, to give such young persons as have attained the age of thirteen years, and have secured the approbation of the clergyman and the inspectors, £5 each if they will act for one year, £7 10s. for the second year, £10 for the third year, and £12 10s. for the fourth year. That they may obtain these salaries considerable proficiency in many departments is expected from them, and each year's examination is to be stricter than any former. To a class of young people still more advanced than the former, and willing to be apprenticed to the teacher from the age of thirteen years to that of eighteen, much higher salaries are promised upon similar conditions. They will each have £10 for the first year, £12 10s. for the second, £15 for the third, £17 10s. for the fourth, and £20 for the fifth. Moreover, if they pass their examinations with peculiar credit their apprenticeship will be abridged, and from the date of that abridgment to the expiration of their term their salaries will be computed as if they were in the last year or years of their original term. Thus, if after two years their whole term be abridged to three years, they will receive for the third year's service (being in the sixteenth year of their age) a salary of £20. It is provided, too, that both the monitors and they shall receive an hour and a half's instruction, specially adapted to their state and prospects, on each or five days in the week.

Let us now attend the course of the young person who, in his eighteenth year, has had his salary of £20, besides gratuitous instruction of high value to him, be his future employment what it may. Supposing, then, that he has passed his various examinations honourably, he will be allowed, at the close of his apprenticeship, to present himself for special examination before the inspectors of the district and the principal of a Normal school, itself subject to Government inspection. If he still pass with credit, the Committee of the Council will be authorized to pay him at the rate of £25 a year, for three years, or for any time not less than one year, on condition of his passing that time as a "Queen's Scholar" in some Normal school beneath their superintendence. They will pay him, that is, £25 a year, if he will learn a trade both honourable and to him lucrative. But if this salary were all, his condition from the age of eighteen years to that of twenty-one, would not be much superior to his condition when apprenticed. During his apprenticeship, however, he was obliged to lodge and board himself. The salary now promised is for clothes alone and pocket money. For the Government undertake to contribute to the Normal school at the rate of £20 for his first year, £25 for his second, and £30 for his third. Assuming £25 as the average sum, the Government will pay, then, £50 a year for three years, to teach promising young folk a useful trade. It must not be forgotten that the funds of the school will not be entirely supplied by the pay for the "Queen's

scholars." Voluntary contributions to the extent, perhaps, of £20 for every student, will be yearly required for the support of these establishments. It would not be too much to say, then, that each student will receive £70 a year, on the condition of acquiring knowledge that will make him independent. But as the State-pay is the matter for our consideration, £50 only must be borne in mind.

And now that the young people have well learned their trade, having for this purpose been kept and taught gratuitously from the age of thirteen years to that of twenty-one, their future employment becomes a matter of serious consideration. For it is to be observed, that they are under no obligation whatever to employ their attainments and their skill in any particular vocation. They have been kept, and well kept, too, for eight years; the last three of which have been spent by them in habits and enjoyments which, to these children of "the people," must have been gentility and luxury. All this, now, has been done, and all the cost of doing it incurred, that as teachers of State schools they may serve the public who have trained them. Yet no bond whatever obliges them to render the expected service. They may become clerks or private teachers; they may establish schools of their own; they may become Catholics, or, still worse, Dissenters; they may do just what they like, and the Government may long in vain for the honourable restoration of the money lost. The only method, it is clear, is to bribe them yet again; and though men and women may be more difficult to bribe than children, yet those who have been bribed successfully for eight years will adhere to the same system, it is thought, as naturally as they breathe. The only art will be to bribe them high enough; and it must be confessed, the Government, considering they are young beginners at this sort of thing, have practised this art with uncommon power and skill. If, after all, the teacher, now of age, can do better for himself than Government can do for him, he is at perfect liberty to try. But if approving of his last eight years' reliance on the State he be willing to rely on it still further, the State will give him £30 a year at present on certain very favourable terms. The £30 is promised on the supposition that he has spent three years in their Normal school. If he has passed two years only, £25 will be given; and if one year, £20. We, of course, assume that no young person will prefer the prospect of £20 or £25 to £30; especially as the "Queen's scholars" in the Normal schools seem to have rather a comfortable and profitable time. £30, then, will be the favourite sum; there cannot be a doubt of that. And this sum is to be granted to these discerning and estimable adults of twenty-one, on the sole condition, as to them, of their taking charge of a school beneath the Government's inspection. There are additional conditions for them; as, that the Committee of the school shall supply them, rent-free, with a proper house, and shall pay them, at least, two pounds for every pound the Government contribute. £100 a year, then, of which £30 is from the State, may be regarded as the lowest salary of the masters. The mistresses will receive two-thirds only of the same. The question is not, be it borne in mind, whether the salary is too large for an able teacher, but whether it is fit for the Government thus to take into its pay instructors of the young in Church of Englandism. As yet, however, but a part is seen of what the Government proposes to do; for they intend to open four additional sources of income on these honoured teachers. For, in the first place, as soon as the teacher is installed, he requires, of course, assistance of the same kind which, as an apprentice, he once gave. And as he will be allowed to have one apprentice, or monitor, for every twenty-five scholars, he will, it is likely, have, at the fewest, four of these assistants at a time. He could not conduct his school without them; but he gives them nothing for their service. The Government pay them, as we have seen; and the Committee, it may be, will generally give them a small additional gratuity; but he whom they assist is not required to give them anything at all, not even the special instruction they are expected to receive. For, if the teacher need the services of an apprentice, the Government insure him £5 annually for the special instruction of that one; £9, if he require and teach two; £12, if three; and £3 for each additional, if he require any more. He is encouraged to take monitors as well, if sufficient apprentices cannot be procured. For one of these monitors he is promised £2 10s. per annum; £4 (£4 10s.?) for two; £6 for three; and £1 10s. for each additional. And thus from £15 to £20 will be added to his annual income.

This, perhaps, is the fittest place to mention that those teachers must be looked upon as clergymen; for the Bishop of Exeter has openly declared his willingness to give them deacons' orders. He purposes, indeed, to honour those only who are most proficient, and whose sphere of action is in towns; and he warns these never to expect the higher rank of priests. It seems, too, that they will be discountenanced from undertaking any ministerial service while engaged in their educational pursuits. But it is not likely that the rural teachers will be long degraded thus beneath the civic; and, as there is no law to prevent a bishop from ordaining priest the man whom his predecessor, or a neighbour, ordained deacon, there is no security that, from the deaconship, many of the more accomplished of these clergy may not pass into the priesthood. The possibility alone of such transition will have power to make eminent Churchmen of them all. Chaplaincies, curacies, benefices, holy and wealthy matrimony—these are possible. Gentility, authority, position—these seem certain. We must calculate on every master's acquisition of the deacon's orders; for there is no provision in the circumstances counteractive of the obvious reasons to expect it. That the Bishop of Exeter deems the previous education such as to authorize the step is evident. He thinks, then, and with reason, that the eight years' drill is quite sufficient to impress "Church principles;" and, deeming it a pity that men so competent to marshal the children of "the people," among whom they themselves once were, should direct their vigorous ambition to secular engagements, he, to secure their energies and experience for "the Church," and to bind them to her cause for ever by the vows of ordination,

proposes to them, in addition to the Government's rewards, all the honour, and advantages, and chances of the deaconship. The clerical name, clerical precedence, occasional clerical performances at least, and the clerical character and clerical "cut" continually—all these large honours shall be theirs by present right as deacons, and, peradventure, in due time, the priesthood too, and something more. The teachers themselves, then, will be clergymen, and, like all other upstarts with the education of a slave, will be of bigots the most bigoted.

It may be thought, however, that these State-schools must, after all, decline from want of scholars. And, doubtless, they cannot be long maintained, if not attended by the young. But by providing able and well educated teachers, one sure means, and one, too, of the surest, is employed for the attraction of the wished-for pupils. The prospect of becoming monitors, apprentices, Queen's scholars, teachers, and deacons, must also be allowed to exert no little influence. The higher prizes in the lottery may be few; but they are precious, and the chances appear equal. Thousands of young people, then, may be confidently looked for. One of them only in a family, or in a circle, may obtain a prize; but that one even will not be allowed to gain it, if the family and near connexions do not satisfy the parochial clergyman. His certificate is essential to success; and no child whose brother or sister goes to a Dissenters' school will have the slightest chance of rising. The planless scheme, then, acts, we see already, on "the people;" no planned one could act better.

But, as yet, we are looking upon one only out of many forms in which children will be bribed by the State into its schools. For the Government promise to all apprentices who shall give general satisfaction, and yet not be deemed worthy of Queen's scholarships and their results, "employment in the public service;" and this is explained by Lord Lansdowne as denoting "appointments in the revenue departments." Office, then, in "the Customs," "the Excise," "the Post-Office," and "the Stamps and Taxes," are henceforth to be held in reservation for such apprenticed pupils as have creditably undergone five annual examinations in the Liturgy and Church of England Catechism, and have enjoyed for five years their parochial clergyman's testimonial. Parents, now, and children, to whom the office of the teacher and the honour of the deacon are without a charm, may yet feel their ambition kindled by the gauger's sliding-rule and the pen of the collector; and thousands more will doubtless be corrupted thus.

But in this State-church lottery there is not a single blank. The consciousness of more than ordinary power, as well as ambition, and the desire of a livelihood, is necessary to inspire the child of an artisan to strive for such posts as a gauger's and a deacon's. Something else, then, must be offered to the great majority of the boys; and for the girls, no provision has as yet been made at all. But our parental Government, though they have formed no "plan," undertake with liberal hand to bribe each child, without exception, who attends a State-church school. To the boys they promise fit instruction in gardening, farm agriculture, and the mechanical trades; and to the girls, the means of becoming by profession seamstresses, cooks, laundresses, housemaids, and domestic servants of every class but that of nursery-maids. For if satisfied with the proposals made by any Local Committee, they will defray half the rent of a model-farm or garden, and make most encouraging grants for the erection of workshops and kitchens, and the purchase of necessary tools and utensils. Nor is this all. For the teacher of the school is to receive a gratuity on account of every scholar whom he shall render sufficiently skilful to become a workman or an assistant in any trade or craft. A similar provision is made in favour of the mistresses; and thus the second of the four extraordinary springs of income is made manifest. The third has been most ingeniously discovered; Lord Lansdowne says, nothing has been "planned." For another gratuity will also be awarded to the teachers on account of every apprentice whom they shall have qualified, in addition to his literary training, to superintend some one of these manual occupations. The last source of income, or of what is equivalent to income, deserves another paragraph.

For Lord John Russell and the "Liberal" party propose, that teachers who after fifteen years' service find themselves disabled by age or infirmities for continuance in office, shall retire on a pension to be paid entirely by the State, and equal to two-thirds of the average annual income, including all emoluments as well as the mere salary enjoyed by him during the last seven years. The teacher, when a child, was bribed by promise of instruction in a trade to go to school. At thirteen years of age he was bribed by an increasing annual salary, and the certainty of what to him must be a handsome provision for his life, either as an exciseman or as a clerical schoolmaster, to forsake mechanical employments and to qualify himself for the more learned callings. Found, at the age of eighteen, to be fitter for the oversight of spirits than of spirit, he was further bribed by an increase of his income, and the more definite prospect of clerical authority, to turn his back on secularities, and live for three years the life of a gentleman and a student. No less a bribe than £50 a-year, his State salary and gratuities, was now deemed requisite, in addition to the deacon's honours and the more legitimate proceeds of a school where school-house, apparatus, helpers, all were furnished without charge or risk to him, in order to persuade him actually to devote himself to what for eight years he had been pledged in honour to perform. Nor was this even deemed enough. For an annuity of £80 a-year is settled upon him; to commence at any hour after he has closed the thirty-sixth year of his age, and the fifteenth of his service, and is found unable to continue in his calling; and to last as long as life shall last, however long it be. As a young child he was for five or six years bribed to learn a little. As a youth he was for five years bribed to learn a little more. As a young man he was still bribed for three years to learn more. As a man he was bribed for fifteen years to fulfil his former promises and teach. And for the rest of his life he is bribed, more enormously than ever, to do nothing but, it may be, to

praise the Government for its liberality, and himself for his good luck.

The direct State-pay of each master cannot be considered as less than £50 a year. £30 is promised in the form of salary; and the stipends for teaching four apprentices or monitors, and the additional gratuities for the successful instruction of both these and the younger pupils in a trade, cannot be computed at a less amount than £20. The Local Committee of the school are bound to give him £60 a year and house-rent, altogether £70, besides supplying him with stock in trade, and insuring him from all loss by bad debts. And as no society would be likely to secure to him such an annuity as that proposed, for a less annual sum than £10, for his fifteen years of service, this sum also must be included in his salary. £130 a year, then, at the least, is secured to him for fifteen years; and is so secured as to leave him £80 a year for life when the stock in trade and the goodwill of the business, which never cost him anything, are given up. It is hardly likely that his "living" while in office will be worth much less than £150 a year; or that a mistress's, therefore, will be of less value than £100. But it seems absolutely impossible, if once the scheme were universally in vogue, for the annual worth to be less than £130 and £85 respectively. It may now be well to estimate the probable aggregate of the annual national expenditure requisite for the perfect fulfilment of the planless wishes of our rulers.

We may consider that there are 11,000 parishes and parochial chapels in England and Wales. One boys'-school for each of these, upon an average, will not be enough. We might reckon three boys'-schools for every two parochial districts; and two girls'-schools for every three. But as the Government assume fifteen years as the average time of service, many teachers dying or retiring within that term, and many retaining office beyond it, it will be more convenient to calculate for 15,000 boys'-schools only, and for 7,500 girls'-schools. 1,000 masters and 500 mistresses must, then, annually enter the normal schools. We will suppose, too, that one boys'-school only out of five has the appendage of a farm, a garden, or a workshop; and one girls'-school only out of three that of a kitchen or a washhouse. In these larger elements, and in the smaller, let us generally follow Mr. Baines's estimates; making, however, a few necessary alterations, and supplying one or two singular omissions. But taking his calculations as the basis of our still rough estimate, we shall be in no danger of excess; for his items are too few, and his only excess is that of moderation. His tables, too, have been for weeks before the public, and no friend of the Government's proposal has thought fit to accuse him of extravagance. The number of male students, then, in course of training at the same time in the normal schools, will be 3,000: 1,000 being admitted every year, and the course lasting for three years:—

The grants to the Normal schools, if estimated at the medium rate of £25 annually for each, will be therefore	£75,000
The grants for 1,500 female students, at two-thirds of £25 each	25,000
The grants to the 3,000 male students, at £25 each	75,000
The proportionate grants to 1,500 female students	25,000
Grants in aid of the salaries of 15,000 masters, at £30 each	450,000
The proportionate grants to the 7,500 mistresses	150,000
Grants to teachers for training 45,000 apprentices, two for each school, at £9 for two	202,500
Grants for training the same number of monitors, at £4 for two	90,000
The salaries of the 45,000 apprentices, at the average of £15 each	675,000
The salaries of the 45,000 monitors, at the average of £8 each	360,000
Grants to 2,000 schools for rent of fields and gardens, at £5 each	10,000
Grant to such for the first tools	1,000
Grants to 1,000 schools for the first tools in workshops	2,000
Gratuities to 3,000 masters for training their assistants to agriculture and trades, at £5 each	15,000
Gratuities to the same for like training of their pupils, at £10 each	30,000
Grants to 2,000 schools for the first apparatus of kitchens and washhouses	2,000
Gratuities to 2,000 mistresses for training their assistants in domestic arts, at £5 each	10,000
Gratuities to the same for the like training of their pupils, at £10 each	20,000
Grants for building schools, workshops, kitchens, and washhouses, according to the vote passed in 1846 for schools alone and a few minor matters	100,000
Pensions to 1,000 masters, at £80 each	80,000
Pensions to 500 mistresses, at £60 each	30,000
The salaries and expenses of 75 inspectors, at £700	52,500
The annual charge of the head office in London	20,000

The total expenditure will be £2,500,000

Considering, now, that the Government propose to spend thus two and a half millions yearly, but without a plan, while Drs. Hook and Kay, each with a plan of his own, propose to spend just about the same amount, the coincidence is striking and instructive.

The charge for pauper-schools and penal-schools might also here be taken into account. But as these two classes have many considerations peculiar to themselves, and to do justice to them would divert us too much from our principal concern, no further notice of any kind will be taken of them here. It becomes us, however, to compute not only the amount of money to be thus henceforth annually voted for the maintenance of Church of Englandism, but the number of people also who will feel the influence of the money when expended.

The schoolmasters will be	15,000
The mistresses	7,500

The pensioners	1,500
The Queen's scholars	4,500
The apprentices	45,000
The monitors	45,000
The inspectors, clerks, and various helpers	1,500

The aggregate of paid functionaries will be then 120,000

Thus, about 100,000 families will be immediately dependent on the Government; and if we assume that there are five persons to each family, we must prepare to find half a million of people in a state of virtual pauperism, in addition to those already thus reduced. Besides, the friends of this half million must not be overlooked; nor the revenue officers indebted to the system, their families and friends; nor the many aspirants who will hope for the chief prizes, and their connexions also; nor, especially, the two millions and a quarter of young people, besides their parents, who, at the rate of 100 scholars to a school, will be found at the same time in the 22,500 State schools of the land, and not one of whom will ever enter even a Dissenting Sunday-school. The whole will constitute a pauper population of three millions at the least; for those are paupers who virtually tell a Government that they can neither learn, nor teach, nor wash, nor sew, nor sweep, nor cook, nor weave, nor dig, nor gain a livelihood at all, unless the Government will help them, and help them, too, from funds extorted from the self-dependent and unwilling. He is no pauper who receives a neighbour's aid when tendered gladly and spontaneously; but he who helps a Government to wring forth that neighbour's money for his own personal advantage, both is a pauper, and is sure to find himself enslaved as such. For when three millions of "the people" are subjected to the Church of England discipline and the Government inspection, according to the scheme before us, not an individual of those three millions will have liberty of either speech or thought. Men can be slaves when not conscious of their slavery. The lowest slavery is that of those who are enslaved and know it not. No man, however, can suppose that "people" trained to the satisfaction of the Government inspectors and the parochial clergymen, will think freely concerning either Church of Englandism or any State-institution in alliance with it. The inmates of a workhouse cease in time to think the things they have never dared to utter. Liberty of speech is liberty of thought; and the same is true, too, of restriction. Three millions of "the people" drilled in the State-schools will, in the course of years, become the parents of at least three millions more, to be drilled by the same masters. What little liberty had been experienced by the parents will be diminished to the children. The feelings or the insensibility of the hereditary pauper will mark out and degrade the class conspicuous now for their struggles after independence. The bondage of "the people" will be perfect. Should a murmur or a groan be ever heard, its only answer would be this:—"We have fed you, we have groomed you, we have bitted you and saddled you, and we hold the bridle in our hands; and who but we should ride you?"

The Government, in order to reconcile "the people" to the enormous expenditure that is proposed, will, doubtless, insinuate that the income-tax, which "the people" do not pay, will meet it, and that to "the people," therefore, the outlay is all gain. The act of bribery will thus be only the more perfect; and if "the people" be corrupt enough to praise it, their thralldom will be only the earlier and more complete. Their only excuse, should they receive the bribe, would be that they themselves contribute to the fund whence it is taken. But so long as an income-tax, or any tax, exists from which they are exempt, so long will the disgrace of voluntary pauperism cleave to all State scholars like a fretting leprosy; and, like it, unfit them for equal intercourse with men. But, after all, it is only to deceive them that the income-tax is mentioned as the source of their supplies; for that which retards the repeal of the income-tax retards the repeal of other taxes too. The proposed expenditure for education would certainly affect the duration of the income-tax; but it would as certainly affect in the same way the tax on light, that stimulant so essential for a healthy frame; the tax, too, upon paper, that is upon truth; the tax on tea, that universal restorative, and sugar, that nutritious and most salutary juice; and the taxes on half-a-dozen other important articles of general consumption. "The people," if they will be wise, will choose the reduction of general taxation and the free education of their children, rather than an important deduction from their income, attended by no compensation but instruction that necessitates their children to become a pauperized and servile race. The measure, be it distinctly understood, is equivalent to an enormous and universal tax. Will the people of England, then, endure this weighty load of additional impost? Will they bear this vast extension of direct Governmental and State-Church influence in the formation of their neighbours' and their children's views? Will they suffer the systematic encroachments made by the Privy Council on the nation's rights and liberties? Will they bear to be compelled to aid in adding 15,000 State-paid clergymen to the swarms already injuring their dearest interests? Will they patiently be forced to take more part in extending the pernicious influences of the Church of England Liturgy and Catechism, not to speak of Unitarianism, Catholicism, and infidelity? Will they calmly witness employment of their earnings to entice the young from the Dissenters' Day and Sunday-schools, and the old from the Dissenters' chapels, and to obstruct in every way Dissenters' costly efforts to do good? Will they tolerate a course of preparation for the payment of all religious ministers alike, and for the total subjection, therefore, of the nation to the joint decisions of the Privy Council and the priesthood? If they be ready for all this submission, it may be well that they should make it, and right early. Those who would bear such things had better, haply, have them. No chain can be fastened but upon the willing; and to render them unwilling, it may be best to fasten it at once.

The scheme appears to thousands to be too wicked to be true; but it is both true, and so wicked that it

ought not to be true. "The Church," at all events, believes it is true. The Committees of State-church schools are already advertising for new scholars on the plea of ability "to obtain advantages for the deserving, amounting almost to a provision for life." The Committees, also, of 3,500 schools have already applied for Government inspection, with its long and crowded train of blessings. The bishops and their clergy are multiplying meetings for the expression of their joy. The aged Archbishop of Canterbury himself, that legalized chief pattern of veracity, good faith, consistency, and all other Christian virtues, forgetting, or hoping that his hearers would forget, all that in the year 1839 he had asserted about "the enormous power given, and the large and undefined discretion left to the Committee," can now, in the year 1847, present his public thanks to the Whig Government for their desires and proposals, though without a "plan." The thing, then, is wicked enough to be quite true.

But many who detect the essential evils of the scheme are still unwilling to withdraw their faith from Lord John Russell. If the scheme be evil, they cannot think Lord John Russell's wishes evil. So good a man, they seem to plead, may well be trusted to work out a wicked measure. But were this conceded, we should yet beware of his possible successors. Neither his natural nor official life may be of long continuance, and who can tell who shall come after him, whether he will be a wise man or a fool? Besides, some people know very little about Lord John Russell's goodness. Good men commonly do good things; and very evil things are generally done by very evil men. A man, too, is frequently esteemed according to his company. Two of Lord John Russell's companions in the education of "the people" are Lord Lansdowne and Lord Grey. That Lord Lansdowne understands this measure so well as to conceal its flagrant evils, and "to make the worse appear the better reason," this has been already made manifest enough. Lord Grey's capabilities, too, are pretty well attested by the recommendation he has lately made to the local Government of Trinidad, to impose a fine on all free negroes who will not send their children to the State-schools there, superior to the fee which they would pay for sending them. Lord John, too, has just sanctioned the appointment of four additional clerical inspectors; and Dr. Kay insinuates that three more inspectors are forthcoming. The simple history of Lord John's meddling with the Governmental education of "the people," especially if illuminated by the history of his conduct concerning Maynooth College and the endowment of the Catholic clergy, is quite sufficient to justify all the imputations alleged against him in this paper, and to warrant the belief that he is capable of anything. He began by building schools; he now makes 15,000 deacons; who can tell where he will end? He says, indeed, that he does not perceive the evils we describe. He needs, then, either honesty or better eye-sight. Lacking either, he is not fit to govern us. He asks, too, for no increase this year of the grant. £100,000 will content him for the present. He forgot, however, to tell the House of Commons that, if he asked for more while plunging the country into debt for Ireland, he knew right well he would be driven from his seat. Nor did he mention that a general election was at hand, and that to ask for more might subject him and his Parliamentary supporters to the execration of their injured constituents. He forgot, too, to describe the way for a Whig Minister to cheat the nation; first, avoiding all discussions, to obtain the tacit consent of the Parliament to new measures, which would not for the present be more expensive than the old; then to appeal to the constituency, pleading the same economical consideration. When returned once more, with all his tail, to Parliament, then, having cunningly secured the consent of both the Legislature and the Constituency to the measure, to show the need of ampler sums for its due execution, and gradually to enlarge the annual vote till all shall be accomplished; and finally, to avoid the unnecessary trouble of applying year by year for money, to introduce a Bill providing for the permanent establishment of the machinery thus tried and serviceable. He may tell us that the Commons have it in their power to stop the grant at any time; or, if an Act be carried, to repeal it. Let him tell us also how such proposals would be welcomed by both Whigs and Tories; what outrages would be raised about vested interests, individuals' distress, and plans already budding into act through faith in the Parliament's consistency; and, in short, how he and his would once more demonstrate that it is easier for them to be stubborn in adhering to the wrong, than to be bold in turning to the right.

Lord John Russell and his friends know very well that Dissenters will not take the money. He would prefer, no doubt, that a few of us should take it; for he could then reproach us with our inconsistency, and thus silence all complaints against the domination of "the Church." He pleads, therefore, that the Government's inspectors shall be unobjectionable men; forgetting, however, that they must necessarily give satisfaction to a Government that sanctions a State Church, and hence are not likely to be satisfactory to us. But while he courts us thus to take a little, it would please neither him nor his Church friends were we to demand and to accept our rightful share. They have fortunately, therefore, for themselves, for they assure us that they did not "plan" it, produced a scheme so monstrous as effectually to forbid our equal participation in its blessings. What they meant for kindness to themselves alone, becomes thus a most merciful device for us.

We are counselled by some friends to leave the Government alone, and thus to let them, by exposing both themselves and the Church-rulers, bring the entire system of a State-Church to a ruinous and speedy close. But God gives no such counsel to his people. Conscience, honour, patriotism, all denounce it. Otherwise, and were we sure of "the people" and ourselves in the hour of temptation, it might not be amiss to let the allies raise their idol and find none to do it homage. We, however, have a testimony to deliver, and a work to do. And if, after all, we be not able to prevent the evil, yet, having done our duty, we shall feel that its existence can in no way be attributed to us, and we shall be the more prepared to hate and shun it still.

THE GOVERNMENT PLAN OF EDUCATION
IN ITS BEARINGS ON WALES.TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL,
FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.

LETTER I.

MY LORD,—It is not often that you, or any other statesman, are troubled with any complaints from the Welsh people. With the exception of the Rebecca riots, and a few unimportant disturbances on the English borders of the country, Wales has for long ages left every Ministry to sleep on beds of roses; and every Ministry has not been loath to enjoy this enviable quietude afforded them by the peaceable and patient dispositions of the inhabitants of Cambria. I trust, therefore, that your lordship will favour me with your attention whilst I endeavour to lay before you some of the obvious bearings of the education Minutes, lately brought forward by the Marquis of Lansdowne, on the state and prospects of Wales. If your lordship and your colleagues have not considered those bearings, there are parties in Wales, besides Dissenters, that have not failed to do so. For if Wales has not been the difficulty of statesmen for the last century, it has been the great difficulty of Churchmen. They have found the language of the country, and the almost universal Dissent of the people, no easy matters to deal with. The language they have cursed, and Dissent they have anathematized, but to no purpose, because the language lives and Dissent prospers. In common with England, Wales has an Established Church. From the days of the so-called Reformation of the Anglican Church down to the present time, the history of the Church in Wales consists of no records besides those of utter inefficiency, shameful neglect of duty, cruel persecutions, and miserable failures. The State-church in Wales has been a national nuisance, and not a national blessing. In this censure, my lord, I do not include every Churchman. I know, and I rejoice to declare, that there have been, and that there are now, eminent and pious individuals of that sect, who have laboured hard, and who have done much for the social and moral elevation of the Principality. But I confidently assert, and challenge contradiction, that the Church, *as such*, has been a pest and not a blessing to Wales. And your lordship is fully aware that the State-church is in the same predicament in Ireland; and you likewise know, that it is the church of the minority in England itself. Indeed, your lordship seems fully convinced that it is not safe for practical statesmen to continue in a course of exclusive partiality to the church of the minority in the United Kingdom much longer. Hence, your anxiety to bring the ministers and schoolmasters of all denominations into the pay of the State. Nevertheless, in endeavouring to bring this about so as to place all churches under Government inspection, your lordship is painfully anxious to afford the lion's share to the English Established Church. To that Church you are a decided friend. Your actions prove it. You do not like the voluntary principle. It is a principle which creates and fosters public opinion, which, of all opinions, is most dreaded by statesmen. You are, therefore, anxious to destroy this mighty principle by inducing its friends to pocket Government money. My lord, if you can succeed in this, you need not give yourself any further trouble in the matter. We generally find, when men put Government money into their pockets, that their principles are put lowermost. Induce all the Voluntaries of the land to accept the loaves and fishes, which with so much statesman-like generosity you offer them, and you will prove yourself the best friend of the State-church.

The Churchmen of Wales, my Lord, like their brethren elsewhere, are now invoking state aid to commence a crusade against Dissent, under the pretence of educating the people. I say *pretence*, because they do not seek to promote education, but *Church extension*. To support this charge my witness is a Churchman, and your Lordship will respect his testimony. In his "Appeal to the friends of popular education upon Church principles on behalf of the principality of Wales and the county of Monmouth," Archdeacon Sinclair, the treasurer of the National School Society, says,—and I beg your lordship to mark the ominous words,—“Another suggestion might be, that by adopting a broad basis, and organizing some system of generalized instruction, in which all sects and parties could unite with the church, we should more effectually obtain a sufficient amount of co-operation to secure the object in view.” But in no scheme of this kind can the members of the Church be expected to co-operate. They do not think that a generalized Christianity, from which the characteristic doctrines of the Church have been expunged, would regenerate either Wales or England, or fit young persons to be good Christians and good members of a civilized community. Such an arrangement, therefore, even if it were not otherwise most exceptionable, would have an opposite tendency to the result desired. It would narrow the basis which it was intended to widen.

“The object of the present appeal is to solicit the co-operation of England in a general movement for extending and improving the education of our fellow-countrymen throughout Wales, in the principles of our common Church. We have good reasons for regarding such principles as our best securities that the children of the Principality will be trained to usefulness in this life, and glory in the next.”—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*, October, 1846.

The object in view, my Lord, is plainly avowed. The venerable archdeacon is quite candid. He broadly states that England and Wales are in a degenerate state, that is, a state of separation from the Church. He conceives that young persons in Wales are destitute of the means necessary to fit them to be good Christians and good members of a civilized community. It is, therefore, insinuated that Dissenters are neither good Christians nor good members of the community. I

will presently, my Lord, submit for your consideration a contrast between the Christianity of the Church and the Christianity of Dissent in Wales. And your lordship shall judge which is best for good Christians and good members of the community. At present I cannot inquire into the meaning of the terms “regenerate,” and “Church principles,” further than to say that they plainly indicate the design of the movement. The present educational convulsions into which certain clerical parties in Wales are thrown, is considered by the *Record* as the result of a Puseyite distemper. It does not matter so much to the archdeacon and his friends, whether the Welsh shall be educated or not; but they seem to think it a question of infinite importance whether they will be church-folks or not. “A change has come over the spirit of their dreams.” Formerly they cared not where the people might go. Go where they might, the emoluments were safe. Now, they are very anxious that they should all go to church, and I care not if I tell your lordship why. If the Established Church in Ireland—which is the church of only one-tenth of the population—is in danger of being removed, the Established Church in Wales—which is the church of only two-ninths* of the population, according to their own showing—cannot, for decency's sake, long survive its Irish sister. This prospect, my Lord, has done a world of good to your church friends in the Principality. Miracles of reformation have been wrought in the church camp; but, unfortunately, this new-born zeal is too deeply marked with self, to be perfectly disinterested. I object, therefore, my lord, to your Educational scheme, on account of its tendency to throw the education of my countrymen into the hands of a party that has proved itself utterly incompetent to be the leaders of the people. I object to Government interference *in toto*; but need not state my reasons for so doing, as my intention is to show the injustice of the present scheme, in its bearing on Wales.

The State Church, my Lord, ought not to be entrusted with the education of Wales. It has forfeited all claims to that honour. Ever since the Restoration of Charles II., the ministers of the Established Church have been in undisturbed possession of emoluments sufficiently large to enable them to enlighten our country, and teach the way of salvation to their fellow-beings. How they have fulfilled their weighty trust, will be presently seen. They found the country lying in darkness, and, but for the exertions of others, the darkness would have increased up to the present hour. This, my Lord, is a serious charge, but one that is fully borne out by the facts of the case. Your lordship will agree with me, that one of the most imperative duties of every church is, the distribution of the word of God among the people. Now, my Lord, I affirm that the State-church in Wales did not create a demand for the sacred word, and that it made but feeble and tardy efforts to give the Bible to our countrymen. I know, my Lord, that the Bible was translated by Churchmen, but the efforts of a few praiseworthy individuals acting under the impulse of their own benevolent feelings must not be set down to the credit of the system. The reformation from Popery took place in the year 1533, but the New Testament was not published in our language until the year 1567, and the whole Bible did not appear before 1588, when it was published in a large folio volume. The number of copies printed, in all probability, were not sufficient to supply all the parish churches, for which it was intended. At the end of thirty-two years, in 1620, when the first edition was probably worn out, another folio edition was issued. This, likewise, did not contain a thousand copies. I have looked anxiously for evidence, to show that some copies of either impression were sold to the people, but can find none, save that a few may be found in private libraries. In 1630, an octavo impression was issued, through the exertions of some benevolent individuals, whose honoured names I have not had the happiness to learn. So, in the course of forty-two years, we had only three editions of the Bible in our own tongue, and probably the aggregate number of copies in the three did not exceed 4,500, even if we add the New Testament published by William Salisbury, in 1567. Here, my Lord, we have a very conclusive proof that the exertions of the clergy in behalf of the Bible were not such as became the leaders of the people. Indeed, my Lord, they were but cumberers of the ground—a body of men whose lives and conversation must have been fraught with mischief. In support of this, I could adduce a multitude of testimonies, but the following will suffice:—In 1641 a petition was presented to the King, complaining that there was not one preacher for every county in Wales. Out of the hundreds of clergy which were well paid, it was hardly possible to find twelve that could preach. Soon after this, however, our country improved, through the labours of Dissenters, and owing to different regulations adopted by the Parliament. Two large impressions of the New Testament and one octavo edition of the Bible were issued, in consequence of which the people improved considerably in many respects. But I need not insist upon this as one of the blessings of Dissent; for I am persuaded every State-churchman will reject with horror any claim to the deeds of the Parliament and the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell. Nor is it necessary for me to weary your lordship's patience by detailing the cruel wrongs and the barbarous persecutions inflicted on the Welsh Nonconformists by the State-church, from the restoration until the passing of the Toleration Act. Legal persecution, of course, must have then ceased, but the poor mountaineers of Wales received not much benefit from the altered state of things. The State clergy went on as usual, and made no efforts to reform the people; on the contrary, they connived at their depraved habits and sinful customs. In the drunken spree and the desecration of the Lord's-day, they were accomplished leaders. The increase of the Dissenters, though steady and encouraging, was not such as to rescue the people from the grasp of priestcraft. They

* To prevent evil, I adopt this estimate, on account of its being generally considered by the Church party as correct, though I believe that the recent statistics compiled at the instance of the Cambrian Educational Society prove the proportion of Churchmen to Dissenters to be only one-ninth.

were held in the thralldom of ignorance from age to age. Generation after generation passed from the stage of life, but the State-church was not moved to pity their deplorable and ruined condition. At length the founders of Welsh Methodism appeared in the South, and Lewis Rees, became the Evangelist of North Wales. Most of the founders of Methodism were deeply attached to the Church of England. But the ecclesiastical authorities, in the true unchanging and unchangeable spirit of State-churchism, scouted their proceedings, and drove them and their revivals out of the pale of the Church. I need not say that the authorities acted quite consistently with the genius of the Church. And assuredly they ought to pursue the same policy towards the Evangelical clergymen of the present day. The State-church, my Lord, was never intended to promote the moral improvement of the people. As a statesman, your lordship knows that such institutions were simply intended to reflect the measures and strengthen the power of political governors. So the State-church in Wales proved. After a trial of two centuries, the people were found by the Welsh Evangelists of the eighteenth century in a state of deplorable and almost incredible ignorance. They were found in a state which strikingly illustrates Archdeacon Sinclair's notions of the Christianity of the Church. Let us briefly consider it. When the Rev. G. Jones, Llanddowror, established his “Circulating schools,” in 1737, hardly 5 per cent. of the population could read, and even many of those did not understand what they read. Very few persons, except those who had attended the ministry of Dissenters, understood who was meant in the words, “Our Father,” in the Lord's prayer. And even later than that, my Lord, some seventy years ago, the moral aspect of Wales was widely different from its present condition. Such was the Christianity of the State-church, that the Lord's-day was desecrated by the practice of *manly sports* (falsely so called), card-playing, cock-fighting, pugilism, and drunkenness. Wakes, horse-racing, and other beastly and unseemly diversions, were common throughout the land. Will the Archdeacon be satisfied with this specimen of Church Christianity? He must: his church never produced any other in Wales. Yet, my Lord, I have no wish to charge the State-church with having *produced* this state of things; but I do say, that, after a trial of more than two hundred years, it utterly failed to reform our country. That noble work has been done by Dissenters, as instruments in the hand of God. But in doing it, they suffered persecutions and endured hardships that will embalm their name with undying honour. Their meeting-houses were destroyed; they were besmeared with mud, pelted with rotten eggs; they were hunted with spears, mobbed with stones, and went about in constant fear of violent death. For their attachment to evangelical religion, our mothers' bodies were exposed to gratify the infuriated rabble that defended the State-church; our fathers suffered cruelties worthy of a pagan land; our evangelists were thrown to the embrace of harlots; and infernal ingenuity exhausted itself in multiplying insults and torments to the saviours of their country. They suffered in their circumstances, in their persons, and in their characters. The Reformation of the eighteenth century was not cheaply bought, and I declare, my Lord, its effects, its glorious results, will not be cheaply sold. Marvel not that we regard with extreme dissatisfaction any measure which would give unlimited power to the sect by which our fathers were hunted to death, and that as late as seventy or eighty years ago.

The proposed educational scheme is the “last hope and pride” of that party. Upon every other they have failed, they do fail, and will fail. That they have failed is evident from the fact that seven-ninths of the people are Dissenters. That they do fail is evident from their woeful lamentations about the Bangor and St. Asaph sees, and the miserable failure of their national schools; to which might be added their vehement denunciations of the statistics lately compiled of the number of attendants at the State Church and dissenting places of worship. That they will fail with their present tactics is as certain as that they have already failed. Yet they are anxious to obtain the mastery in Wales; and your lordship may rely upon it that they will not scruple as to the means, so that the end will be gained. With them, as well as with another party which your lordship is wishful to patronize, “the end justifies the means.”

That I may not be accused of partiality, in my estimate of the number of State-churchmen, I will lay before your lordship the views of the Rev. W. Jones, vicar of Nevin, Carnarvonshire, on that question. I am content to take his estimate, and rest my case thereon, though I think it is vastly too favourable to the Church. “Wales is divided into 844 parishes,* in which there are about 1000 churches and chapels (of ease). Suppose that on an average they contain 400 each; so there is accommodation in the church for 400,000 persons. For several reasons, however, such as the distance of the churches from the inhabitants, the strong aversion of the people to long prayers, their love of variety and excitement, and many others, we cannot reckon more on average than 200 attendants to each church and chapel. We thus conclude that about 200,000 enjoy the ministry of the Established Church.” After a good deal of praise to the Church, which is pronounced, on your lordship's authority and that of Lord Brougham, to be the most excellent church in Christendom, the writer declares, that unless the ministrations of the Established Church be not better adapted to the taste of the people, and its ministers become more efficient, that Dissent will prevail, lengthen its cords, and reign supreme through the whole Principality. Surely, my Lord, if Welsh Dissent be the horrible monster represented by most Churchmen, the most excellent church in Christendom must be at its wits' end, before it has been found necessary to recommend it to stoop, in order to imitate the mean practices and vulgar tricks of Dissenters, for the sake of lengthening out its lingering existence! And yet, my Lord, the model-church of Christendom has already done this. The more Dissent-like she has become, the more she has prospered. The little success which has followed the *prudent* employment of pecuniary con-

* 838 is the correct number.

siderations, and other temporal inducements, has, in connexion with dissenting innovations, enabled Churchmen to take courage just now, and come forward to represent themselves as entitled to Government help. The Education Minutes will serve them admirably, and in my next letter I will proceed to prove this to your lordship.

I have the honour to be, my Lord,
Your Lordship's obedient servant,
EVAN JONES.

Tridegar, March, 1847.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[Advertisement.]

SPANISH TOWN, JAMAICA.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR.—The letter signed "Conservator" was originally published anonymously in a Jamaica paper; the effect it produced in Spanish Town, where all the parties and proceedings are well known, induced a professional gentleman to write to the editor for the name of the author; the editor replied that the article was sent to him by Mr. Anderson. The same letter is republished in your journal of the 10th instant, with a postscript attached, which is not in the original, containing a scrap of character from an unattested voucher. "Conservator" states, that he is impelled by "his duty to the cause of honour, of truth, and religion," to notice an advertisement in the Nonconformist: the reference, Sir, is to a publication in your journal, on November 18th, 1846, signed by me as treasurer of Mr. Phillippo's committee, containing an extract from a letter I then had recently received from Mr. Phillippo, describing his peculiar situation and his sufferings. It is just, Sir, that I should declare, the letter which has provoked the holy zeal of "Conservator" was my own; that I alone am responsible for its contents, and also for all that I now write, because it behoves me to meet the attack anonymously made by one mask, and in so many and candid a manner avowed by another. It certainly is unusual, unprofessional, and derogatory for a solicitor anonymously to make a public attack upon the party he is opposing in a suit, and to choose that time for the outrage when the Court was supposed to be deliberating upon a decision.

It is not for me, Sir, to arraign motives springing from "duty to the cause of honour!" I have only to mark the anomalous course covertly taken by "Conservator" in discharging the duty of a solicitor. It is proper, and may be useful, to state that Mr. Phillippo's solicitor, in Jamaica, is Mr. Charles Harvey, a stranger to me, employed by him before that I knew of the existence of litigation in Spanish Town; when a knowledge of the existing disputes was brought before me, by the circumstance of the rejected bill for one hundred pounds (as stated in Mr. Phillippo's case, by his committee), and thereby I became involved in correspondence upon the distressing subject.

My first care was to inquire the character of the solicitor to whom the interest of Mr. Phillippo and the mission property had been committed. I applied to a gentleman, resident in Spanish Town, and holding an official situation in the colony, with whom I have long been connected. He gave me the most satisfactory assurance of the integrity, honour, and ability of Mr. Harvey, and he also gave me, *unasked*, a gratifying testimony to the high character of Mr. Phillippo in the town, and the general utility of his public services to the colony. It is, then, Sir, upon the honour of Mr. Harvey, and upon the well-attested piety, integrity, and truth of the persecuted, faithful missionary, Mr. Phillippo, that I stand forward to repel the malignant attack of "Conservator," pledging my own claim to each and every invaluable quality I have named, that what I assert shall be the truth, as I have received it from them, confirmed by official documents, and therefore I conscientiously believe.

I have written a long, but I trust not an irrelevant introduction to a subject of vital importance to the Baptist Denomination, involving more than is at present known to them, but which must shortly be developed.

It would require a pamphlet, a volume, to enter into detail. I shall take "Conservator's" paragraphs *seriatim*, and without widely travelling out of his record, briefly offer such observations as are requisite to refute. In replying to his assertions, I request a reference and close attention to his letter.

"Conservator" says, "The chapel in question was settled in 1823." I will not cavil at unmeaning words. The Trust-deed was dated in January, 1821. Mr. Phillippo arrived in Jamaica in 1823. I believe that he formed the church; it is certain that he then became its pastor, and continued in the pastorate undisturbed, until he came to England in 1842.

"Conservator" asserts "Mr. Phillippo and Mr. Dowson were co-pastors." I answer, that is untrue; Mr. Dowson arrived in Jamaica in 1841;—I know not in what month. Mr. Phillippo left the island in May 1842; he had not resigned, he was in full exercise of his rights as pastor, and before his departure he engaged Mr. Dowson to supply during his absence. Mr. Dowson was not then, nor has he ever been, co-pastor with Mr. Phillippo. During Mr. Phillippo's residence in England, I know that Mr. Dowson always addressed him as the sole pastor of the church; and it is recorded in the Court, upon the affidavits of the deacons, leaders, Sunday-school teachers, and members of the church in Spanish Town, corroborated by the church books, that Mr. Phillippo had ever been its sole pastor, and that Mr. Dowson's attestations in support of his claim to the co-pastorate, were utterly destitute of foundation, and wholly devoid of truth. "Conservator" in continuation says, "there are also three other churches, of which Mr. Phillippo and Mr. Dowson were acting co-pastors." That is not so; there are not three churches; the places named by "Conservator" are only stations in connexion with the church at Spanish Town, over which Mr. Phillippo has ever been sole pastor. The well known and deeply lamented want of suitable ministers, prevented the formation of separate churches—pastors could not be found, therefore Mr. Phillippo continued the

onerous duty of his stations and his church, and I aver that "Conservator's" also is a fiction.

The next paragraph is written with a master's hand; it is the solicitor himself, in his office. We must read it as it is written, and then, by the light of truth, the avowed ruling motive and leading star of "Conservator," endeavour to make it plain. We read, "that a power of attorney was sent by Mr. Gurney, Mr. Hanson, and Mr. Hoby, to Mr. Abbott and Mr. Phillippo, to enjoin, &c." Alas, that luckless deed! Let us examine it in all its bearings by the several statements and inferences of "Conservator." It is true that a power of attorney was sent—I have not its precise date, "Conservator" has omitted that—dates sometimes are inconvenient; it was sent "by the trustees in England." What for? Why, for this purpose, which I entreat may be attentively marked—it was sent to direct and enable Phillippo and Abbott, as the agents and legal representatives of the London trustees, to resist an attack which previously had been commenced upon the mission property and premises, and to enable them, legally, to defend the same.

"Conservator" tells us that Mr. Harry, one of the original trustees, "had by deed filled up vacancies in the trust without any authority from the trustees in England;" and therefore "Conservator" says, "I pray you hear him"—therefore the attorneys of the English trustees, Phillippo and Abbott, did, in the name of those trustees, and under their authority, apply to the Court—mark what for, and what was the prayer of their petition!—that the Court would stay them, Harry and Dowson, from proceeding by an ejectment which Harry had previously commenced, to obtain possession of the mission property and premises, turn out Mr. Phillippo, and to give the chapel to Mr. Dowson. Here is the origin of the suit in Chancery written as with a sunbeam. The application to Court was virtually made by the direction of the trustees in England, because it was actually the only available defence against proceedings which "Conservator" had commenced in the names of Harry and his illegally-appointed trustees, to alienate the mission property to themselves, and to dispossess the pastor of more than twenty years' standing. How truly, then, does Phillippo write, in the letter quoted by me, and stigmatized by "Conservator," "My resistance, so far as the law is concerned, has been entirely passive;" and he is corroborated by Mr. Harvey, who, in a recent letter to me, writes—"I have merely acted throughout on the defensive." "Conservator" proceeds, "Mr. Dowson was made a party defendant." Assuredly he was; he could not be otherwise. Phillippo and Abbott, the attorneys of the English trustees, prayed the Superior Court to restrain Harry and Dowson, the original aggressive plaintiffs in the Court below. Let any person conversant with legal terms read this, and pass sentence upon Phillippo or "Conservator," who charges the missionary with falsehood. Phillippo was passive until compelled to take active legal measures of defence, in fidelity to the cause he served.

The attorneys of the English trustees prayed the Court to restrain Dowson, the plaintiff, from aggression. "Conservator" is also a reservator; he has omitted to state, but I must make known, that the first act of "Conservator's" clients, Mr. Dowson and Mr. Harry, with others acting under their concocted deed, was to take forcible possession of the mission premises. In the presence of Mr. Dowson, and by his direction, a mob, armed with sticks, tore down the fence of the burying-ground, entered the chapel, affixed posts and a gate in the breach they had made, that they might, as they afterwards did, lock the same and take away the key, thereby to keep possession. "Conservator" has not told us that those riotous proceedings, and their continuance, disturbing the public peace, and endangering life as well as property, compelled the interference of the magistrates, who took, and kept possession of, the premises by a police force. Surely "duty to the cause of truth and honour," had it been in exercise, would have compelled "Conservator," possessing as he declares he does the information "necessary to expose it." Why did he shrink from narrating this first proceeding of his client, which gave birth to all that has subsequently taken place, being followed by Dowson's action of ejectment, and by the prosecution of parties in a criminal court by himself and others? We learn next that "a motion in the cause, supported by affidavits, was made, and the Vice-chancellor did stay the action in ejectment,"—all that is true and confirmatory of Phillippo's declaration, "I was passive." I repeat that the Court of Equity restrained the nominal defendant there from pursuing his course as active plaintiff below; and I ask emphatically, why should a solicitor unfurl the banner of "honour and of truth," and thus thereby mislead the understanding by a legal quibble upon words?

It is not true, although "Conservator" avows that the parties were co-pastors; the Vice-Chancellor made no decree; he gave no opinion upon that point; he merely advised and recommended joint occupancy of the chapel. The affidavits made by Mr. Dowson and his adherents, who were strenuous in their endeavours, by any means, to induce the court to believe in an existing co-pastorship, were, as I have stated, crushed by the overwhelming power of truth. Why, then, should "truth and honour" be enlisted in "Conservator's" ranks when he intrudes his own unjustifiable assertion that "the dictum of the judge had decided incidentally the main question, and the suit ought to have been stopped"? We next have in course of narration a proceeding which "Conservator" prefaces "shortly afterwards," and I invite close attention to what took place at an assemblage of people called together by Mr. Dowson and "his office-bearers" (Conservator is not conversant with the language of the sanctuary), "in order to get rid of their inconvenient position." I believe that "Conservator" witnessed the scene, although he is not a member of a Dissenting Church, "where every publicity was given," and all persons were admitted indiscriminately to a church meeting, called for the solemn purpose of electing a pastor. This mockery of a church meeting was called by placarding the walls of the town. The magistrates, remembering former meetings; and to prevent a recurrence of violence, appointed special constables to attend what resembled a contested election. Polling stations were appointed at the doors. The chairman and several of those persons who collected

votes were not members of any Dissenting community. Tickets of membership were distributed outside without discrimination, and received inside without inquiry. "Conservator" says, "1,300 members' votes were recorded for Mr. Dowson; not a vote was recorded for Mr. Phillippo." Now, that is true, and speaks volumes, in the case; for Mr. Phillippo, with the actual members of the church in Spanish Town, for more than one thousand in number, sat quietly together in the adjoining school-rooms, during this violation and burlesque of church order. "No individual offered in his behalf," says "Conservator." Certainly not, is the answer; they better understood the duty of church members. Mr. Phillippo was advised to deliver to the person who should preside in the democratical assemblage a protest on the part of himself and his church, and this protest was delivered, or, as "Conservator" terms it, "offered by the individual on his behalf." Mark the trickery by which it is sought to impress the idea that only one vote was tendered for Mr. Phillippo. "Conservator" says, "Everything of the least interest to friends in England must evidently depend upon the validity of that election;" assuredly he speaks the truth, and I will put the issue there, assuming that the account I have given is correct, and I have it from the respectable persons I have named. Is there one member of a Baptist church in England who will admit its validity? Will not every one blush with heartfelt sorrow that men professing to be united in the fellowship of the Gospel, should so degrade its enactments and disgrace themselves. "Conservator" asks, "How dare Mr. Phillippo say, that he is contending for the defence of the Gospel?" I will not answer the insolence of the querist; let others speak; and I entreat those I am addressing, to read the copy of a letter published by Mr. Phillippo's Committee in his case, dated Kettering, Jamaica, August 12, 1845, addressed to the Mission Committee in London, and signed by nineteen of the senior missionaries, imploring that committee "to press the suit for the decision of the Chancellor, which alone could remove their difficulties; a decision," say they, "absolutely necessary for the safety of that station (Spanish Town) and the welfare of the mission generally." They say, "Many of us have considered the case, and have every confidence in our brother Phillippo." It is stated in that case "that the oldest and best known missionaries write to the same effect; and they all attest, most unequivocally, that Mr. Dowson is utterly unfit for the post he seeks, that Mr. Phillippo has been most cruelly treated, and that, if he is not sustained, a grievous calamity will be inflicted on the whole mission in Jamaica." Mr. Tinson, who is one of the senior missionaries, and has signed the above letter, has written repeatedly to the same effect. Read in the same case the testimony of the excellent William Knibb, and especially that of the departed Burchell, with the characteristic reply of Mr. Knibb, when the leader of this opposition menaced him with personal violence. "If you," said he, "had the piety of Enoch and the zeal of Paul, and were you to live to the age of Methuselah, you could not repair the mischief you have done." Never shall I forget the scene when the dear departed Burchell attended Mr. Phillippo's Committee, in London; he declared, with the most affecting energy, that the safety and honour of the whole mission in Jamaica were identified with Mr. Phillippo's success. Let these suffice, without further quotations, to answer the man who has introduced himself to public notice, cloaked in the garb and assuming the visage of one "discharging a duty to the cause of religion!" Hear him, I beseech you, and uprightly judge his motives by their fruits.

We now are brought by "Conservator" to "the worst of the case;" the perversity of Mr. Phillippo's imagination, his standing alone, his personal and sole liability, his wilful falsehood, a charge from which, says "Conservator," nothing can relieve him. I have passed the prefatory side-blow at "the advertiser," that is myself, Mr. Editor, at whom "Conservator" is welcome to cut unheeded; my business is the defence of another; and, if Phillippo is rescued from the slanderer, "Conservator" is no more. But what, then, becomes of Mr. Anderson? Let us proceed over this rugged road, the "worst part" of the dark case, and take the "glimmering" first, "the expected prison." I assert, without the possibility of contradiction, that, when my dear friend, Mr. Phillippo, wrote that, to me, heartfelt letter, he was—and "Conservator" well knows, for it is upon the record—he was in hourly expectation of incarceration. His fears were afterwards dispelled; his person and his effects were saved by the vigour, the tact, and the rectitude of his solicitor. Next, as to his assertion of "standing alone," it must be told, in reply to "Conservator," what he himself well knew, that those English trustees, in whose name, for the protection of whose property, and under whose power of attorney Mr. Phillippo was acting; those trustees did demand from Mr. Harvey, by their secretary, and in a letter written to the secretary by Mr. Harvey, in reply to that demand, dated March 6th, 1846, they were informed that "those gentlemen, the English trustees, were not liable to him, Mr. Harvey, and that he had not any claim upon them, &c." I quote this letter without further comment upon it; now let "Conservator" mark, Mr. Harvey was employed by Mr. Phillippo, and thus, upon the demand of his trustee friends in England, the whole cost and charges of this expensive suit of theirs were laid upon Phillippo alone. The Christian declared that he did not "fear defeat in the cause of truth and righteousness. The costs created were enormous, he alone was liable, he was utterly unable to pay, yet he was sustained by a consciousness of integrity in the path of duty." It is this man, Sir, that the rat behind the arras sneeringly asks "if his dread of consequences indicates confidence in the success of his litigation." Let him take one thrust in reply. I answer, "Conservator" being a solicitor in full practice, well knows the sad experience of many men whose litigation has "ended successfully," yet they themselves have been harassed in its progress, and destroyed in their victory by reckless costs, created and imposed by an adverse and vindictive lawyer? Dees "Conservator" know that Phillippo had any cause for such apprehension? I aver that he does

know it. But we must not digress. One observation more, and I will leave "Conservator," with his gross charge of falsehood, to occupy the vacant degrading position which, like him of old, he had prepared for the execution of the man whom every Christian will delight to honour.

It is not in the power of "those excellent, confiding Christian men, the wealthy men" of England, so well-known to, and so bedaubed by "Conservator," for whom, he says, the whole battle is fought by Phillippo, to make themselves acquainted with, but now it is expedient that shortly they must by strict and public investigation be told the truth. "Conservator" may be assured that the shafts of his indignation fall powerless on Mr. Phillippo's committee. In their name, and in my own, I leave him to, and I pray that he may be rendered capable of feeling well-deserved pain from the fact that he has made an unbecoming, and disgracefully unprofessional, attack upon a man who stands as high in character and respectability, I will not say, as himself—that were saying little—but as any man of any religious persuasion in the island of Jamaica.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
JOSEPH FLETCHER.

Union Dock, Limehouse, March 19th, 1847.

* * As the Case published by Mr. Phillippo's committee is referred to, a copy (postage free) shall be sent in answer to any application.

LITERATURE.

Memoir of William Knibb, Missionary in Jamaica.

By JOHN HOWARD HINTON, M.A. London: Houlston and Stoneman. pp. 562.

It is a consoling and edifying consideration, that however disposed we may be to look back on past times as furnishing the most distinguished prototypes of excellence, the race of noble and heroic minds is not yet extinct. Vacuity is not the rule of moral existence any more than of physical life; and Providence not only raises up, from time to time, men fitted for their spheres, but ordains that the very exigencies which necessitate the men shall both excite and equip them for their action. No one can throw his eyes over the last half century without remembering many moments of emphatic interest and stirring summons; nor fail to rejoice, that when the "hour" has come the "man" has been never wanting. Among those who have been developed by and for their times, William Knibb, whose biography is here presented, was conspicuous. How prominent a part he took in the emancipation of the slave, and in the maintenance of his just rights, no reader needs to be informed. Certainly, to none was the cause of emancipation under deeper obligations. Mr. Hinton has performed an acceptable service to the public in reviving and embalming his well-known character.

William Knibb was born at Kettering, on the 7th of September, 1803. His youth was marked by quickness and volatility, by energy and generosity of character. Early in life he obtained a situation in a printing-office established first at Kettering and afterwards at Bristol; and, at the latter place, joined himself to the Baptist church under the pastoral care of the late Dr. Ryland. He early distinguished himself by his religious zeal and activity, and by that sympathy on behalf of the negro which gave a foretaste of his future eminence. The early death of his brother, who had been engaged as a missionary in Jamaica, prompted him to the resolution that, if the Baptist Society would accept him, he would go and take his place. He was, accordingly, after some preparatory studies in the Borough-road, ordained to this work, and, on the 5th November, 1824, he sailed for the West Indies. There are many illustrations of the abhorrence with which the young man regarded the first aspects of slavery on his arrival, though his convictions had not yet acquired their ultimate force. It is impossible, however, that we can follow the biographer through the minutiae of Knibb's earlier history. The reader will peruse with much interest the incidents connected with the revival of the planter's hostility to the missions in the West Indies, and with the foremost part taken by Knibb in that fierce conflict.

The announcement made by the King's ministers in 1831, that they would adhere to their pledges in favour of the negro population, and the opposition occasioned by this determination among the planters, was followed, as is well known, by a general insurrection of the slaves of Jamaica, under the impression that the Sovereign had manumitted them, and that their masters alone prevented them from being free. Outrages and desolation were the natural result, and the odium fell upon the missionaries, as having instigated the slaves. Several Baptist chapels were destroyed by way of reprisal, and Knibb was imprisoned, though there was an utter lack of all that could support a criminal prosecution against him. After six weeks' confinement he was therefore discharged. From this time follows the recital of a series of encounters, marking the virulent hostility of the planters on the one hand, and the rightful indignation of Knibb on the other. It was now that the combination of the planters against the missionaries compelled him to set sail for England; and one of the most delightful portions of the volume is the narrative of the anxieties under which he landed, the disadvantages under which his first public appearance in England was made, and the contagious fervour with which he soon inoculated the right-minded portion of the British public. The impulse once given, his progress was a continued triumph, and contributed mightily to the passing of the act of emancipation in the following year. After a grant by Government of a sum towards the restora-

tion of the demolished chapels, a meeting was held in the City of London Tavern to accomplish the rest, and a splendid result of £10,000, amidst the astonishment and delight of the assembly, proclaimed. This was Knibb's farewell previous to returning to his scene of labour—a memorable and affecting period, for the details of which we must refer to the volume itself.

Many of our readers will dwell with eagerness on the refutation, in these volumes, of various charges brought against the West Indian missionaries. To these we shall do no more than refer.

The apprenticeship clause of the Emancipation Act proved, as the friends of the slave had anticipated, a mere modification of the previous system. Vigorous agitation compelled the Government to grant the reality instead of the name. In Jamaica efforts were, however, made to throw the negroes into a state of excitement; and, for that purpose, a wicked report was circulated, that Massa Knibb was shot. The base design failed, as did others of the same complexion. The next exertions made by Knibb were in the cause of education. To him, also, the Baptist Missionary Society owes the first suggestion of the African mission.

In 1839 the malice of his enemies invented a new mode of attack upon Knibb. Under the pretext of recording the incidents of his early life, the most false and mischievous statements were made, and published by the newspapers, both of Jamaica and England. A suit instituted against this accuser, in the Court of Jamaica, failed. The case was again sued, in this country, and damages were awarded to Knibb. To vindicate his character he paid a second visit to England. It was at this time he made the following emphatic statement:—

"When I last appeared before you, I took a solemn vow, at the altar of eternal mercy, that in the strength of God—and that has been given to me, and without one muscle relaxed, I have returned among you—I would never cease till I had smitten this chain from my brethren. And since that object has been effected, in the strength of the Divine Being, I have made another resolve, that if you will aid us by your sympathies, and your prayers, and your exertions, we will never rest until America is freed from her foulest stain."

This great work, not yet accomplished, must remain as Knibb's legacy to posterity. Mr. Hinton says:—

"Throughout the whole of these journeys, in the course of which it was computed that he had, in five months, travelled 6,000 miles, attended 154 public services, and addressed 200,000 persons, the reception of Knibb was more than cordial, it was enthusiastic. The honours won by him in 1832 were still remembered, and they constituted a sort of glowing atmosphere for his re-appearance. It was as though the sun, having set in glory, had risen again before the crimson tints of the west had departed. His progress through the country resembled less a journey of business than a triumphal procession."

Knibb was a third time in England in the year of the jubilee of the Baptist Missionary Society, and again in 1845, to lay before the committee the pecuniary difficulties connected with the Jamaica missions. From the last visit he returned to Jamaica to die, at the age of forty-two.

We think none of our readers will wish this volume shorter. Mr. Hinton has treated his subject with much discrimination; and, whilst he appropriately fills up the occasional chasms, has wisely permitted Knibb to speak in large measure for himself. We cannot conceal from ourselves that the interest of the volume somewhat diminishes after we have passed the period of emancipation; still, however, it is so diversified by important and tragical details as never to become tedious. Every Christian will delight in the evidences afforded by this work of Knibb's unaffected piety. His more public qualities are already before the world, and will live in their great results. His excellencies were, indeed, associated with some corresponding faults; but those who knew him best will accord with his biographer in the conviction that, while he manifested much less of these faults than might have been anticipated from the frailty of human nature, under the influence of divine grace he lamented and mortified them, together with those numerous other evils which every one who knows his own heart detects, although his fellow-men may not charge them upon him.

Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave. Written by HIMSELF. Third English Edition. London: R. Yorke Clarke and Co., 55, Gracechurch-street. pp. 170.

"Disguise thyself as thou wilt, Slavery, still thou art a bitter draught; and though thousands have been made to drink of thee, thou art no less bitter on that account." So wrote Sterne in the last century, whilst every fresh experience of the present time serves only to confirm and corroborate the testimony. The Narrative of Frederick Douglass is a fearful exhibition of what many, alas! are anxious to palliate or conceal. Our conviction, however, seconds that of Mr. Calhoun, that there is "no mistaking the signs of the times." The counsel and device are of man, and must come to nought. To this desired consummation the present volume of Mr. Douglass will, we doubt not, largely contribute. Its style is plain and vigorous—its facts harrowing, and indeed excruciating—its spirit stern and uncompromising. Mr. Douglass wages no carpet warfare, and his blows on slaveholding religion are those of a mace wielded by a giant. Witness the following passage:—

"I find, on reading over the foregoing 'Narrative,' that I have, in several instances, spoken in such a tone and manner respecting religion as may possibly lead those unacquainted with my religious views to suppose me an opponent of all religion. To remove the liability to such misapprehension, I deem it proper to append the following brief explanation:—What I have said respecting and against

religion I mean strictly to apply to the slave-holding religion of this land, with no reference whatever to Christianity proper; for between the Christianity of this land and the Christianity of Christ I recognise the widest possible difference—so wide, that to receive the one as good, pure, and holy, is of necessity to reject the other as bad, corrupt, and wicked. To be the friend of the one is of necessity to be the enemy of the other. I love the pure, peaceable, and impartial Christianity of Christ; I therefore hate the corrupt, slave-holding, women-whipping, cradle-plundering, partial, and hypocritical Christianity of this land. Indeed, I can see no reason but the most deceitful one, for calling the religion of this land Christianity. I look upon it as the climax of all misnomers, the boldest of all frauds and the grossest of all libels. Never was there a clearer case of stealing the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil. I am filled with insufferable loathing when I contemplate the religious pomp and show, together with the horrible inconsistencies which co-exist in the slave states. They have men-stealers for ministers, women-whippers for missionaries, and cradle-plunderers for church members. The man who wields the blood-clotted cowskin during the week fills the pulpit on Sunday, and claims to be a minister of the meek and lowly Jesus. The man who robs me of my earnings at the end of each week, meets me as a class-leader on Sunday morning, to show me the way of life and the path of salvation. He who sells my sister for purposes of prostitution, stands forth as the pious advocate of purity. He, who proclaims it a religious duty to read the Bible, denies me the right of learning to read the name of the God who made me. He who is the religious advocate of marriage robs whole millions of its sacred influence, and leaves them to the ravages of wholesale pollution. The warm defender of the sacredness of the family relation is the same that scatters whole families—sundering husbands and wives, parents and children, sisters and brothers, leaving the hut vacant, and the hearth desolate. We see the thief preaching against theft, and the adulterer against adultery. We have men sold to built churches, women sold to support the gospel, and babes sold to purchase Bibles for the poor heathen! all for the glory of God and the good of souls! The slave-auctioneer's bell and the church-going bell chime in with each other, and the bitter cries of the heart-broken slave are drowned in the religious shouts of his pious master. Revivals of religion and revivals in the slave-trade go hand in hand together. The slave-prison and the church stand near each other. The clanking of fetters and the rattling of chains in the prison, and the pious psalm and the solemn prayers in the church, may be heard at the same time. The dealers in the bodies and souls of men erect their stand in the presence of the pulpit, and they mutually help each other. The dealer gives his blood-stained gold to support the pulpit, and the pulpit in return covers his infernal business with the garb of Christianity. There we behold religion and robbery the allies of each other; slavery and piety linked and interlinked; preachers of the gospel united with slaveholders! A horrible sight, to see devils dressed in angels' robes, and hell presenting the semblance of paradise."

The foregoing extract is from the appendix; we have made none from the narrative itself, which will be better read entire. We hope it will receive a wide circulation; we are sure it is calculated to have a damning effect on the system it reprobates.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

1. *Royal Gems.* Part XII.
2. *The Christian in Palestine.* Part XI.
3. *The Days of Laud.* By Mrs. C. NEWTON.
4. *Evangelical Alliance.* Report of the Conference.
5. *Christendom, its State and Prospects.*
6. *Pinnock's Geography made Easy.*
7. *Pinnock's History of England.*
8. *The Pulpit and the People.* By PETER RYLANDS.
9. *Memoir of William Yates, D.D.* By JAMES HOSY, D.D.
10. *Memoir of William Knibb.* By J. H. HINTON, M.A.
11. *Dick's Christian Philosopher.* Vol. II.
12. *Select Writings of Robert Chambers.* Vol. II.
13. *Comic History of England.* No. IX.
14. *The Heroines of Shakspeare.* Part XII.
15. *Illustrated Edition of the New Testament.*
16. *The late Secession from the Church of Scotland.* By JAMES MACFARLANE.
17. *The Life of Ramon Monsalvate.* By Rev. R. BAIRD, D.D.
18. *The Young Botanist.* Religious Tract Society.
19. *The Life of Cyrus.* Ditto.
20. *Pictorial History of England.*
21. *A School Geography.* By JAMES CORNWELL.
22. *Winslow's Glimpses of Truth.*
23. *The Banner of the Covenant.* By R. SIMPSON.
24. *The Faith of Dying Jacob.* By R. GOUGE.
25. *A Treatise on Diet and Regimen.* By W. H. ROBERTSON, D.D.
26. *The Comprehensive Tune Book.* By Dr. GAUNTLETT.
27. *The Journal of Health and Disease.* Vol. II., No. IX.
28. *A Review of the Law relating to Marriages.* By T. C. FOSTER, Esq.
29. *China; Political, Commercial, and Social.* Part IV. By B. M. MARTIN, Esq.
30. *Hogg's Weekly Instructor.* Parts XXIV. and XXV.
31. *The Greatest Plague of Life.*
32. *Narrative of Frederick Douglass.* By Himself.
33. *Tail's Magazine.*

GLASTONBURY.—Mr. George Jeffreys, of Highbury College, has accepted the cordial invitation of the church and congregation worshipping in the Independent Chapel, Glastonbury, to become their pastor; and he will enter upon his labours on the first Sabbath in April.

AEROSTATION.—Mr. Gale, of Camberwell, is stated to have brought the balloon to much greater perfection than any hitherto constructed. His improvements are described to consist in elastic tubes, pipes, or what is called hose, by which all the gas that escapes from the lower part of the machine is received and conveyed into large bags or receivers, attached to the middle of the balloon, so that the expansion of the gas be what it will from heat, or other causes, the gas cannot be let off and preserved, and no danger of bursting incurred. The car is also differently constructed from the old method; and the aeronaut can, without trouble, lower beneath the car another car, to any distance he may please, in which scientific experiments can be carried on, or fire made use of, without danger to the balloon. The cars are very light, being made of prepared cork and India rubber. This balloon is nearly as large as the great Nassau; and made of silk, and the designs for the external painting, by Mr. D. Roberts, are of a high order of appropriate ornament.—*Literary Gazette.*

ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL, CITY-ROAD.

(INSTITUTED 1758.)

FOR THE MAINTENANCE, CLOTHING, AND INSTRUCTION OF ORPHAN AND OTHER NECESSITOUS CHILDREN, OF BOTH SEXES, OF EVERY RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION, AND FROM ANY PART OF THE KINGDOM.

To assist in meeting the large Expenses necessarily incurred by the erection of a New Building, for Two Hundred and Forty Children,

A FANCY SALE

WILL BE HELD on the 8th, 10th, 11th, and 12th days of MAY NEXT,

At the House and Grounds of the Institution,

HAVERSTOCK-HILL, HAMPSTEAD-ROAD.

UNDER THE IMMEDIATE PATRONAGE OF HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN,

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of KENT,

Her Grace the Duchess of SUTHERLAND,
Her Grace the Duchess of MARLBOROUGH,
The Right Hon. the Countess of MARCH,
The Right Hon. the Countess of TANKERVILLE,
The Right Hon. the Countess of SHEFFIELD,
The Right Hon. the Countess of HARDWICKE,

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of GLOUCESTER,

The Right Hon. the Countess of ANTRIM,
The Right Hon. the Countess of CLARENDON,
The Right Hon. the Countess of WILTON,
The Right Hon. the Countess of EFFINGHAM,
The Right Hon. the Countess of GAINSBOROUGH,
The Right Hon. Viscountess SYDNEY,

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of CAMBRIDGE,

The Right Hon. Viscountess COMBERMERE,
The Right Hon. Viscountess JOCELYN,
The Right Hon. Lady FEVERSHAM,
Lady CULLING EARDLEY SMITH,
The Hon. Mrs. LEICESTER STANHOPE,
The Hon. Miss HARLEY, &c., &c., &c.

THE objects sought to be benefited by this Charity are Poor Orphan and other Necessitous Children, who are admitted between Seven and Eleven years of age, from any part of the kingdom, provided they are in good health, and have neither been the inmates of a prison nor a workhouse. They remain in the School until they are fourteen years of age, when the Boys are placed out as apprentices, with a premium of £5, or clothing to that amount; the Girls are trained for domestic service, and are provided with situations, each girl having a suitable outfit of the value of three guineas. During the seven following years, to encourage them to persevere in good conduct, they are annually rewarded with sums varying from five shillings to one guinea, on producing satisfactory testimonials from their employers. Altogether, One Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty-two poor children have been admitted into the School, most of whom, after receiving a religious, useful, and suitable education, have been placed in situations in which they have, by industry and good conduct, obtained a comfortable livelihood, and some of them have risen to influential stations in society, and become Governors of the Charity; and, although it was instituted for twenty boys only, it clothes, educates, and wholly maintains, at the present time, Fifty-four Girls and Eighty-five Boys, making a total of One Hundred and Thirty-nine. The New Building is intended for Two Hundred and Forty, and this number the Committee are anxious to receive. They cannot, however, expect it, unless the whole expense of the Building is met by the special efforts now making, of which this Fancy Sale forms part of the plan. As this Institution receives from all parts, and has, in fact, Orphan Children from eighteen counties now in the School, the Committee think this circumstance will enlist the active assistance and kind advocacy of the Ladies throughout the kingdom. The Committee will be happy to receive the names of such Ladies as will undertake to assist in this important object, when circulars shall be sent to them.

Contributions of Useful and Ornamental Work, Clothing for the Poor, Paintings, Drawings, Music, Prints, Books, Autographs, Minerals, Shells, Flowers, Fruit, Botanical Specimens, or any Light Articles of Manufactured Goods, with pecuniary aid, forwarded to Mr. Joseph Soul, the Secretary, at the Office of the Institution, 19, Gresham-street, near the Bank of England, or Haverstock-hill, before the 15th of April, 1847, will be gratefully acknowledged.

* * Ladies are requested to put a moderate price upon the articles sent.

HINTS TO LADIES

IN REFERENCE TO THE ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL BAZAAR.

1. Enrol your own names on the Ladies' General Committee.
2. Promote, by every means in your power, the formation of Local Committees in the town or neighbourhood in which you reside.
3. Correspond with friends at a distance, and importune them to comply with the suggestions already given. Small papers for this purpose, explaining the object, and adapted for the penny postage, may be had of the Secretary.
4. Omit no opportunity of urging upon all the Ladies of your acquaintance, wherever they may reside, the claims which the Orphan Working School has upon their benevolent regard, inasmuch as it receives Orphan Children from every part of the United Kingdom, without distinction as to sex or religious parentage.
5. Avail yourself of every seasonable opportunity of soliciting Contributions, and of making the Bazaar the subject of conversation.
6. Endeavour, with the assistance of your friends, to furnish a Stall entirely from your immediate neighbourhood, and, if possible, with articles of local manufacture.
7. Wherever you have influence with Manufacturers, strongly recommend them to send goods of light and elegant, or useful manufacture, to the Bazaar. As the premises are very extensive and lofty, a finer opportunity can scarcely be offered them for displaying their beautiful fabrics.
8. Should it appear to you desirable that a direct appeal be made from the Office to any Ladies of your acquaintance, forward their names, without delay, to the Secretary, at 19, Gresham-street.
9. As the Bazaar will be opened on Saturday, the 8th of May next, and continued on the 10th and two following days, little time is allowed for preparation. On this account, the Committee will feel obliged by the most prompt assistance being rendered.
10. Where a Local Committee cannot be formed, the Contributions of individuals will be gratefully accepted, and may be forwarded direct to the Office, or to the nearest receiver in the neighbourhood.

GENERAL COMMITTEE OF LADIES.

(To whom Contributions may be sent.)

METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS.

Miss Bishop, Bishopsgate-street
Mrs. P. Bunnell, St. Martin's-le-Grand
Mrs. Cubitt, 6, Great George-street, Westminster
Mrs. Esdaile, 24, Upper Bedford-place
Miss Furness, 162, High-holborn
Mrs. Dr. Hewlett, 1, Adelaide-place, Stepney
The Misses Hubbard, Queen-street-place
Mrs. Hudson, 27, City-road
Miss Jackson, 29, Belitha Villas, Barnsbury-park
Mrs. Jenkyn, Coward College, Byng-place
Mrs. Jennings, King-street, Portman-square
Mrs. Johnson, Charles-square, Hoxton
Miss Jones, 65, St. Paul's-churchyard
Mrs. Lake, De Beauvoir Town, Hoxton
Miss Lemmon, 5, Hoxton-square
Mrs. Macey, 37, Great Titchfield-street
Miss C. Martin, 6, Princes-street, Spitalfields
Mrs. Mawby, 11, Aldgate
Miss George Meason, 29, Upper Seymour-street, Euston-square
Miss Morgan, 18, Tottenham-court-road
Mrs. Owen, 98, Oxford-street
Mrs. John Penny, Millbank Prison
Mrs. Richardson, Gordon-square
Miss Sadler, 87, Great Guildford-street
Mrs. Sherwin, Cunberland-street, Curtain-road
Miss Sherwin, 6, Thurlow-place, Hackney-road
Mrs. J. Starkey, 5, Old Bond-street
Miss Sturge, City-road
Miss Thompson, 18, London-street, Commercial-road East
Mrs. Tidman, 27, Finsbury-square
Mrs. Tyler, 10, Haberdashers-place, Hoxton
Mrs. Waugh, Goudge-street
Miss Wright, Dorset-place, Pall-mall East

SUBURBAN DISTRICTS.

Balham Hill—Mrs. J. Field
Ball's Pond—Mrs. Luckin, 14, St. Paul's-place
Barnet (East)—Mrs. Moore, Willenhall
Battersea—Mrs. Soule
Blackheath—Miss Samworth, 2, Egerton-road.
Brentford—Mrs. Young
Brixton Hill—Mrs. Marlborough, 6, Streatham-place
Brixton (North)—Mrs. C. Jones, 2, Amphill-place, Vassall-road
Camberwell—Miss Wills, 13, Addington-place
Camden Town—Mrs. Eustace Carey, 3, Eastcott-place, Ferdinand-street
Chelsea—Mrs. Archer, 18, Hans-place, Sloane-st.
Clapham—Mrs. Thomas Hepburn
Clapham Common—Mrs. Coombs
Clapton—Mrs. Samuel Morley, Five Houses
Clapton (Lower)—Mrs. Appleton
Dalston—Mrs. Norton, Rose Cottage
Deunark Hill—Mrs. W. W. Nash
Deptford—Mrs. Wire, Stone House, Loam-pit-hill, Lewisham-road
Edmonton—Mrs. Russell, Russell-street
Edmonton—Mrs. Clark
Edmonton—Mrs. Alderman Challis
Fidley—Mrs. Crow
Greenwich—Mrs. Samuel Williams
Hackney—Miss Goss

Hackney—Miss Vines, London-fields
Hammersmith—Mrs. Pittman, 9, Grove-place
Hammersmith—Miss Robson, Mare-street
Hammersmith—Mrs. Cumming, 3, Sussex-place, Bridge-road
Hampstead—Mrs. B. Dawson
Hampstead—Miss Starling, Pilgrim-lane
Haverstock Hill—Mrs. Morrison, 2, Park-cottages
Highbury—Mrs. Lowman, 6, Powis-place
Highbury—Mrs. Thomas Challis, jun.
Highbury—Mrs. N. Johnstone, 11, Adelaide-road
Herne Hill—Mrs. George Clayton
Highbury—Mrs. Price, Highbury-terrace
Highgate—Miss A. Dixey, North-hill
Holloway—Mrs. Besley, Melrose Lodge
Holloway (Upper)—Mrs. Tapper, 1, Belgrave-ter.
Homerton—Miss S. Rutt, 4, Sutton-place
Hornsey-road—Mrs. R. Simpson, 23, Hanley-rd.
Hounslow—Mrs. Ashby
Islington—Mrs. Barker, Lower-road
Islington—Mrs. J. Soul, 20, Brunswick-parade
Islington—Mrs. Joy, 109, Upper-street
Kensington—Miss Bird, Hornton Villa
Kensington—Miss Hall, 35, Pembroke-square
Kennington—Mrs. C. T. Gabriel, 3, The Green
Kentish Town—Mrs. Mann, 3, Old Chapel-row
Kilburn—Misses Mann, ditto
Kilburn—Mrs. W. Forster, 11, Torianae-terrace
King's Cross—Mrs. Hutton, 5, Hamilton-place
King's Cross—Miss Eckett, 6, Argyle-square
Lambeth—Mrs. E. Corderoy, 1, Lambeth-terrace
Leyton—Mrs. Fraser, Lea-bridge-road
Lewisham—Mrs. C. M. Robinson, Etloe House
Maida Hill—Miss White, 4, Lyon-terrace
Mile End—Mrs. Baldock, 1, Union-row
Mile End—Miss Baldock, ditto
Mile End—Mrs. Sandford, 10, Wentworth-place
Newington Green—Miss Cooper
Norwood—Mrs. Arthur Anderson
Peckham—Mrs. Oliver, 8, Rye-terrace
Peckham—Miss S. Jeffery
Peckham—Miss Wade, Elm Grove
Pentonville—Mrs. Lander, 5, Bond-street, Claremont-square
Pimlico—Miss E. Bayes, 5, Winchester-place
Pimlico—Mrs. Martin, 1, Chester-place
Plaistow—Mrs. Charles Marten
Putney—Mrs. Ashton
Regent's Park—Mrs. Stratten, 65, Hamilton-terr.
Richmond—Mrs. Martin, 10, Halford-place
Rotherhithe—Mrs. Phillips, 28, Paradise-row
Shackleton—Mrs. C. Benthall, 4, Down-cottages, Rectory-road
Snaresbrook—Mrs. Ebenezer Clarke
Stamford Hill—Miss Foster
Stepney—Miss Kennedy, the Green
Stoke Newington—Mrs. Aveling, 24, Nelson-ter.
Streatham Hill—Mrs. J. Brown, Oakland Lodge
Tottenham—Miss E. Forster, the Green
Tottenham—Mrs. Dawson, White Hart-lane
Totteridge—Mrs. Thorowgood
Tulse Hill—The Misses Hall
Tulse Hill—Miss Wright
Twickenham—Mrs. Percival Wright, Park-road
Upton, West Ham—Miss Sheppard
Walworth—Miss Eisdell, 7, Walworth-place
Walworth—Mrs. Stone, 114, Manor-place
Walworth—Mrs. F. W. Morgan, 32, Walworth-road
Wandsworth—Miss Cade
Wandsworth—Mrs. Hickson

Winchmore Hill—Mrs. John Udall, North Villa
Whetstone—Mrs. Jarman, Frein-park
Woolwich—Mrs. F. Pearce, Rectory-place

COUNTRY DISTRICTS.

Abingdon—Mrs. Lepine
Arundel—Mrs. New
Basingstoke—Miss Curtis, Chineham
Bath—Mrs. Blair, Bathwick-hill
Biggleswade—Mrs. John N. Foster, St. Andrews
Birmingham—Mrs. William Morgan, Hunter's-lane, Handsworth
Bishop Stortford—Mrs. Chaplin, the Chantry
Bishop's Cleeve—Miss Jennings
Bishop's Cleeve—Mrs. William Taylor
Bocking—Miss Gosling
Bridgewater—Mrs. Jeffreys, Mount Radford
Brighton—Mrs. Gouley
Brighton—The Misses Gouley
Brighton—Mrs. Penfold, Middle-street
Bristol—Mrs. Crip, Stokecroft
Bristol—Mrs. Roper, St. Michael's-hill
Bristol—Mrs. George Thomas, Redcliffe-street
Bristol—Mrs. W. D. Wills, Portland-square
Bromley (Kent)—Mrs. Verrall
Bury St. Edmunds—Mrs. Sabine
Cambridge—Miss Sophia Foster, Brooklands
Cambridge—Mrs. E. Foster, 2, Scroop-terrace
Cambridge—Mrs. Finch, Sidney-street
Canterbury—Mrs. Sudlow, the Limes
Canterbury—Mrs. Means, Whitaker's-terrace
Chatham—Mrs. Gray, Baddow-road
Chelmsford—Mrs. Lewis, Plum Cottage
Cheshunt—Mrs. Philip Smith, the College
Cheshunt—Mrs. George Hepburn
Chislehurst—Mrs. Rouse, Heathfield
Clare—Miss Fanny Clarke, Nethergate-street
Clifton—Mrs. Gregory
Colchester—Mrs. Davids, St. John's-green
Coventry—Miss Chaplin, Lexden
Coventry—Mrs. Cash, Sherborne House
Coventry—Mrs. Herbert, Albion-terrace
Cowes (East), Isle of Wight—Mrs. Catlin
Darlington—Mrs. Hopkins, Woodside
Darlington—Mrs. Perkins, Conic-cliffe-lane
Devizes—Mrs. Anstie, Park-da'e
Dublin—The Misses Lowther, 10, Pleasant-street
Edinburgh—Miss Smith, Sydneyfield, Granton-road, by Inverleith-row
Edinburgh—Mrs. Armour, 18, Buccleuch-place
Edinburgh—Mrs. Colquhoun, 11, Brighton-crescent, Portobello
Edinburgh—Mrs. Renton, Buccleuch-place
Edinburgh—Mrs. Harrison, 15, Walker-street
Edinburgh—Miss Christie, 17, St. James's-square
Epsom—Mrs. Dr. Graham
Evesham—Mrs. W. B. Edge
Exeter—Mrs. Bristow
Footscray—Miss Woodfull
Frome—Miss Tuck
Glasgow—Mrs. Barlas, 13, Greenlaw-place, Paisley-road
Glasgow—Mrs. Robson, 2, Queen's-crescent
Glasgow—Mrs. Munns, 18, Great Hamilton-street
Glasgow—Miss M'Farlane, South Park
Gloucester—Mrs. Medland, London-road
Gravesend—Mrs. Tippetts
Halstead—Mrs. Ash
Harrow—Mrs. Thomas Chaplin
Hastings—Mrs. Field, 1, Croft
Henley-on-Thames—Mrs. C. Benwell
Hitchin—Mrs. Eaton
Hitchin—Mrs. Lucas
Hitchin—Mrs. Langford, Wymondley House

Horncastle—Miss Fisher
Ipswich—Miss Clitherow
Ipswich—Mrs. James Conder
Kidderminster—Mrs. Sprigg, St. Margaret's
Kidderminster—Mrs. Kitley, Summer Bank
Kingswood—Mrs. G. B. Lea, the Larches
Leeds—Mrs. Glanville
Leeds—Mrs. Thomas Armstead, 20, Grove-terrace
Leeds—Mrs. S. Denison, 6, Upper Fountayne-st.
Leicester—Mrs. Jacob Hood, Bardon Hall
Leicester—Mrs. Cripps, East Field House
Leith—Mrs. Schaw, Links
Leith—Mrs. R. Archer, Summerfield
Lewes—Mrs. Wille
Lewes—Mrs. Jones
Liverpool—Miss Henderson, 28, Catherine-street
Liverpool—The Misses Clare, Daulby-street
Maldon—Mrs. Digby
Manchester—Mrs. John Armstrong, 4, Wilton-terrace, Cheetham-road
Manchester—Mrs. William Bickham, Whalley Range, Moss-side
Manchester—Mrs. Halley, Plymouth-grove
Manchester—Mrs. B. Shipton, Upper Broughton
Newcastle-on-Tyne—Mrs. Fringle, Clavering-place
Newport (Monmouthshire)—Miss Ellis, Higham-place
Newport (Monmouthshire)—Mrs. Byron
Northampton—Mrs. Hagger
Norwich—Mrs. Brock, St. George's, Colegate
Norwich—Mrs. Alexander, Surrey-street
Norwich—Mrs. A. Reed, St. George's, Colegate
Nottingham—Mrs. Cripps, Park-terrace
Nottingham—Mrs. Elliott, Fletcher Gate
Nottingham—Mrs. Harrison, Bridgeway Gate
Nottingham—Miss Morley, Castle Gate
Oxford—Miss Pike, St. John's-terrace
Pershore—Mrs. Henry Hudson, jun., Wick
Ramsgate—Mrs. Mortlock Daniell
Reading—Mrs. Evis
Reading—Mrs. W. W. Morley, Eldon-square
Reading—The Misses Stiff, Oxford-road
Rochford—Mrs. Monk
Royston—Mrs. S. S. England
Ryde (Isle of Wight)—Miss Moore, Norlington Cottage
Saffron Walden—Mrs. Barnes
Scarborough—Mrs. Andrews
Scarborough—Mrs. B. Evans
Sheffield—Mrs. Milbourn, Long Westgate
Sheffield—Miss M. Brady, Lenny-grove
Southampton—Mrs. Knight, 32, High-street
St. Neots—Mrs. C. J. Metcalf, jun., Chawston House
Stroud—Mrs. Nath. Mailing, Stanley House
Sydenham—Mrs. Dyer, Round Hill House
Taunton—Mrs. Beadon, 1, Crescent
Tenterden—Mrs. Covey
Thatcham, Berks—Mrs. Barfield, Priory House
Trowbridge—Mrs. Page
Tunbridge Wells—Mrs. Dixon, Calverly Park
Uppingham—Mrs. Bryan, Lyddington House
Uppingham—Miss Rule, ditto
Ventnor (Isle of Wight)—Mrs. Medway
Wakefield—Mrs. Samuel Stocks
Warrington—Mrs. Peter Rylands
Windsor—Mrs. M'Crea
Witham—Mrs. Robinson, Ivy Chimneys
Woodbridge—Mrs. Knight, Brook House
Woodchester—Mrs. S. Leonard, Atcombe House
Wooler—Mrs. Darling, Hetton House
Worcester—Mrs. Redford
Worcester—Mrs. Crowe
Worthing—Miss Brewer
Worthing—Mrs. Barden
Yarmouth (Great)—Mrs. Bayly, King-street.

Office of the Charity, 19, Gresham-street, near the Bank, where Subscriptions will be thankfully received.